

July—August, 1931

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

The Story of Archimedes

Mark Twain?

Address of Alexander Hamilton

Causes of Depression

Charles G. Merrell

Prize Winning Essay

Robert Pollard Fox

EARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York
JAMAICA OFFICE, 72 Johnson Avenue, Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 305 Broadway, New York City

OSCAR H. GEIGER, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 165 Broadway, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading Rooms, \$1.00. Club subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

JULY—AUGUST, 1931

VOL. XXXI

No. 4, WHOLE No. 167

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.

AUSTRALIA: Percy R. Meggy, Sydney, New South Wales.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.

SPAIN: Antonio Albendin, Cadiz.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

HUNGARY: Prof. Robt. Braun, Budapest.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade, Av. Pal Legislativo 40, Mexico City.

INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	99
THE STORY OF ARCHIMEDES.....Mark Twain?	101
TAXATION OF LAND VALUES	
.....Prize Winning Essay. Robert Pollard Fox	103
ADDRESS OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON.....	105
CAUSES OF DEPRESSION.....Charles G. Merrell	107
"PROGRESS AND POVERTY".....Nicholas Murray Butler	111
JAMES R. BROWN. REPORT OF LECTURES.....	112
OUR PREMIER LECTURER.....The Editor	113
THE HENRY GEORGE FOUNDATION EXPANSION PROGRAMME.....	115
GEORGE RAYMOND GEIGER'S "PHILOSOPHY OF HENRY GEORGE".....	117
UNEMPLOYMENT.....W. E. Macklin	118
BOOK REVIEW.....B. W. Burger	123
CORRESPONDENCE.....	124
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS,.....	126

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product.

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXI

JULY—AUGUST, 1931

No. 4

Comment and Reflection

NOTHING is so unpopular these days as communism. Yet it is perhaps well to remember the little group of voluntary communists who followed Christ in Galilee. But more important than the practices of these men in a state of society essentially simple and almost primitive, loomed large the economic principle of equality. They were the standing protestants of the time against the unjust distribution of wealth, the preachers of *a new earth* as well as *a new heaven*.

THEIR economic teachings are seldom referred to, and when they are, are usually misapplied or misunderstood. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's", though the things they would have rendered unto Caesar were few enough. "The meek shall inherit the earth;" "Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor;" "The poor ye have always with you,"—which certain Christian pastors of the House of Have fatuously take to have meant a justification of a permanent social inequality.

BECAUSE the Galilean's economic creed taught the principle of equality the religion of the Carpenter's son found early acceptance in the most obscure quarters of Rome. The earliest names identified with the spread of Christianity are those who resided in the dwellings of misery, humble hawkers of trifles in localities that must have closely corresponded to the tenement wards of our great cities. Here lived Aquilla and his wife Priscilla in the days when the church was without prelates, when the chief apostles were tramps and vagabonds, human exen along the quays of Rome amid casks and bundles of ill-smelling merchandise who first heard the name of Jesus.

TO Asia and Syria, accustomed to subjection, the new doctrine spread like prairie fire. It found a lodgment in Rome largely because the common people of Rome were sunk in poverty and misery. To Roman praetor and Roman patrician the new doctrines were naturally unpopular; a religion that taught the equality of rich and poor was certain to arouse a hatred for its teachers, however blameless their lives, however tolerant their creeds. So government, then as now, the instrument of the oppressors, straightway set the lions upon them, an argument the Christians found it impossible to refute.

BUT despite opposition, and because Rome was dying at the core, the new religion made rapid strides. But now comes the tragedy. It was not long before the democracy of Jesus gave way to institutionalism. The religion of Jesus receded as the friends and defenders of privilege sought for the perpetuation of social injustice the alliance of the ermined and sceptered followers of the companion of fishermen.

IT was from Rome—geographically the heart of the faith—that Christianity propagated itself through all her conquered provinces. The old vessels of the Roman Empire were filled with the new wine. The channels of the old conquest became the channels of the new. The imperial dream which the Master with a divine gentleness had put aside became the aim and ambition of his later disciples. The dream of the enfranchisement of man was abandoned and on the anvil of the church was forged anew the instruments for the enslavement of the ignorant and poor. Thus was a great experiment in economic democracy wrecked at its beginning. Not even the divine tradition of Jesus was sufficient to keep it alive; the new religion travelled easily from the Manger to the Palace, and lost its claim upon the hearts of men as it tightened its grip upon temporal ambition and grew in power and magnificence.

LET it not be thought that the early doctrine of economic equality wholly died. It lived, even if obscurely, in the teachings of many of the early fathers; it survived among the priests who were closer to the people, and it travelled with the Jesuit missionaries; it found utterance in the practice and injunctions of priestly societies like that of St. Vincent de Paul. But it was overshadowed as time went on by the power and solemn grandeur of brick and stone; ritual, formula and temporal domination. It ruled the hearts of men by means foreign to those of the simple precepts of Christ.

YET the Church was never more powerful spiritually than when it was weakest materially. It never wielded so great an influence than when it represented the poor and oppressed. That attitude of Christ, and to some degree of the early Church first attracted the multitudes. History may repeat itself if the Church—the Catholic Church, we may be permitted to say, because of its superb organization, and because it need only be true to its early tradi-

tions—might at this moment, when privilege has wrought its worst in the culmination of wide-spread depression and disaster, sound the message of the world's emancipation. How the power of the Church would awaken! Did not Christ say—we are not sure of the quotation—"If I am lifted up I shall draw all men unto me." If a message should emanate from Rome that would sound that inspiring call, then indeed would all men be drawn unto her. Certainly we should not like to have posterity say of the present Pope what Elizabeth Barrett Browning said of another in the bitterness of her disappointment:

"Perchance it is that other eyes may see
From Casa Guido windows what is done
Or undone—but whatsoever deeds they be
Pope Pius will be glorified in none."

Let us hope that such words need never be said of the kindly soul that rules from the Vatican.

IT is a far cry from the subject under consideration to those of present day communism, about which so many of our statesmen have become unduly excited. We think most of their excitement is simulated and in the person of Hamilton Fish a little comical. It is of course quite convenient to have objects for epithets—and the psychology of this is well understood by the demagogue. Abolitionists were called "Negro lovers." Socialists and Communists are "reds." Single Taxers have escaped similar characterization. We ought to rescue communists from opprobrious characterization by members of a government which is willing to share with Al Capone the profits of his racketeering. We are sure that every respecting communist would repudiate communism of that kind! But such facts, in incident and kind, are involved in the whole system of taxation by which privately produced wealth is taken for public revenue in the interests of those who confiscate public values, and this disarms all the harsh criticism applied to "wild-eyed" communists.

OF course there is a half truth in communism. There is a kind of property (so regarded by false conceptions of what is property) known as land values. These are common property because produced in common. This is just as truly a communist possession to be used for common purposes as the production of the individual for individual satisfaction. To the former the phrase "our own" and to the latter "my own" is applicable. To the community should go what is the result of communal enterprise, land value, site value, economic rent, whatever you choose to call it, and to the individual the product of his labor. If communists could realize that this would bring about the equality they hope for and merely dream about, they would be getting somewhere. As it is they are running counter to one of the profoundest instincts of humanity—the right to property that is the result of individual effort. All outside of that is, if you please, communistic in its essence—rightfully public property. But the only

thing really outside of it, and not due to individual effort at all, is the rent of land, which is the price of social service reflecting everything that is done by a cooperating society. And in what has been said earlier of the communism of the followers of Christ it should be remembered that there was a purely voluntary communism, not forcible government communism. Of such communism in a society where production has reached the ultimate minimum, what cost who will say that there may not be room?

THE important news of the quarter is the moratorium in the payment of war debts, the suggestion of President Hoover. It is difficult to see how the carrying out of the proposal can have any general influence upon business. It will enable Germany which is the chief beneficiary, to gain a breathing spell in somewhat lower taxes. But the gain is too small to affect even Germany materially. It is doubtful if it will result in the employment of a single individual man. Economic conditions remaining as they are, trade throttled by tariffs, and taxation growing heavier every hour, matters are not to be remedied by even a fractional indulgence in the payment of debts. Postponement of payment over a period of five or twenty-five years does not cancel the obligations, which are simply put off to some future time. If silly people, like the character Dickens who, when he gave his note for a bill, "thank God that was paid," imagine that a debt is discharged when it is extended, there may be a slight revival of business, for people act that way. But the reckoning comes later.

WE can imagine that at least one effect might be produced by the moratorium, and if so this dismal forecast is somewhat discounted. And that is simply this: that perhaps the conviction may grow that these debts never will be paid and that the great burden may be ultimately lifted from the shoulders of humanity. Such conviction in some degree might aid in the recovery of business but it cannot do much until trade barriers are removed and taxation is shifted from improvement values to social values. That is the crux of the question; not to see it is remain blind to the problem, which is not to be solved by the postponement of debts, but the resort for needed revenue to the sources provided by nature in a world infinitely and potentially rich. But we struggle along with "remedies" of trifling importance, halting, childish and inconsequential, of which this moratorium of a kindly intention but narrow visioned executive is a fine example.

PRESIDENT HOOVER utters dire threats against employers whom he suspects of plotting to cut wages. Let him threaten. So long as there are but nine jobs for ten men, so long will wages be cut. The remedy is to open up a tenth job. Nature has provided plenty of them but Hoover is helping to keep them closed. Does he not know that?

The Story of Archimedes

BY MARK TWAIN

"GIVE me whereon to stand," said Archimedes, "and I will move the earth." The boast was a pretty safe one, for he knew quite well that the standing-place was wanting, and always would be wanting. But suppose he had moved the earth, what then? What benefit would it have been to anybody? The job would not have paid working expenses, let alone dividends, and so what was the use of talking about it? From what astronomers tell us, we should reckon that the earth moved quite fast enough already, and if there happened to be a few cranks who were dissatisfied with its rate of progress, as far as I am concerned, they might push it along themselves. I would not move a finger nor subscribe a penny-piece to assist in anything of the kind. Why such a fellow as Archimedes should be looked upon as a genius, I never could understand; I never heard that he made a pile or did anything else worth talking about. As for that last contract he took in hand, it was the worst bungle I ever knew; he undertook to keep the Romans out of Syracuse; he tried first one edge and then another, but they got in after all, and when it came to fair fighting he was out of it altogether, a common soldier in a very business-like sort of way settling all his pretensions.

THE FORCE OF LAND MONOPOLY

It is evident that he was an overrated man. He was in the habit of making a lot of fuss about his screws and levers, but his knowledge of mechanics was in reality of a very limited character. I have never set up for a genius myself, but I know of a mechanical force more powerful than anything the vaunting engineer of Syracuse ever dreamt of. It is the force of land monopoly!

It is a screw and a lever in one; it will screw the last penny out of a man's pocket and move everything on earth to its own despotic will. Give me the private ownership of all the land, and—will I move the earth? No, but I will do more. I will undertake to make slaves of all the human beings on the face of it. Not chattel slaves, exactly, but slaves nevertheless. What an idiot I would be to make chattel slaves of them. I would have to find them salts and senna when they were sick, and whip them to work when they were lazy. No, it is not good enough. Under the system I propose the fools would imagine they were all free. I would get a maximum of results and have no responsibility whatever. They would cultivate the soil; they would dive into the bowels of the earth for its hidden treasures; they would build cities and construct railways and telegraphs; their ships would navigate the ocean; they would work and work, and invent and contrive; their warehouses would be full, their market glutted, and—

The beauty of the whole concern would be
The wealth they made would all belong to me.

HOW IT WORKS

It would come about in this way. As I owned all the land, they would, of course, have to pay me rent. They could not reasonably expect me to allow them the use of the land for nothing. I am not a hard man, and in fixing the rent I would be very liberal with them. I would allow them, in fact, to fix it themselves. What could be fairer? Here is a piece of land, let us say—it might be a building site, or it might be something else—if there was only one man who wanted it, of course he would not offer me much; but if the land be worth anything at all, such a circumstance is not likely to happen. On the contrary, there would be a number who would want it, and they would go on bidding one against the other in order to get it. I should accept the highest offer. What could be fairer? Every increase of population, extension of trade, every advance in the arts and sciences, would, as we all know, increase the value of the land, and the competition that would naturally arise would continue to force rents upward, so much so that in many cases the tenants would have little or nothing left for themselves. In this case a number of those who were hard-pushed would seek to borrow, and as for those who were not hard-pushed, they would, as a matter of course, get the idea into their heads that if they only had more capital they could extend their operations, and thereby make their businesses more profitable.

ADVANCES TO LANDLESS

Here I am again. The very man they stand in need of: a regular benefactor of my species, and always ready to oblige them. With such an enormous rent roll I could furnish them with funds up to the full extent of the available security; they could not expect me to do more. As to interest, they could fix it themselves in precisely the same manner as they had fixed the rent, and as in the case of rent the highest offer would, of course, be accepted, everything below par being prudently declined. I should then have them by the wool, and if they failed in their payments it would be the easiest thing in the world to sell them out. They might bewail their lot, but business is business. They should have worked harder and been more provident; whatever inconvenience they might suffer, it would be their concern and not mine. What a glorious time I would have of it! Rent and interest, interest and rent, and no limit to either, excepting the ability of the workers to pay. Rents would go up and up, and they would continue to pledge and mortgage, and as they went bung, bung, one after another, it would be the finest sport.

OWNERSHIP OF PEOPLE

Thus, from the simple leverage of land monopoly, not only "the globe itself" but everything on the face of it would eventually belong to me, and the rest of mankind would be my obedient slaves. It hardly needs to be said that it would not be consistent with my dignity to asso-

ciate with the common rank and file of humanity; it would not be politic to say so, but as a matter of fact, I not only hate work, I hate those who do work, and I would not have their stinking carcasses near me at any price. High above the contemptible herd I would sit enthroned amid a circle of devoted worshippers. I would choose for myself companions after my own heart. I would deck them with ribbons and gewgaws to tickle their vanity; they would esteem it an honor to kiss my glove, and would pay homage to the very chair I sat on; brave men would die for me, parsons would pray for me, and Bright-Eyed Beauty would pander to my pleasures.

LAW AND ORDER

For the proper management of public affairs I would have a Parliament, and for the preservation of law and order there would be soldiers and policemen, all sworn to serve me faithfully; their pay would not be much, but their high sense of duty would be sufficient guarantee that they would fulfill the terms of the contract. Outside the charmed circle of my society would be others eagerly pressing forward in the hope of sharing my favors; outside of these would be others again who would be forever seeking to wriggle themselves into the ranks of those in front of them, and so on outward and downward until the deep ranks of the workers forever toiling and forever struggling merely to live, and with the hell of poverty forever threatening to engulf them. The hell of poverty, that outer realm of darkness where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth—the social Gehenna, where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched—here is a whip more effective by far than the keenest lash of the chattel slave owner, urging them on by day, haunting their dreams by night, draining without stint the lifeblood from their veins and pursuing them with relentless constancy to their very graves. In the buoyancy of youth, many would start full of hope and with high expectations, but as they journeyed along, disappointment would follow disappointment, hope would gradually give place to despair, the promised cup of joy would be turned to bitterness and the holiest affection would become a poisoned arrow quivering in the heart! What a beautiful arrangement—ambition urging in front, want and fear of want bringing up the rear.

CUTT-HROAT COMPETITION

In the conflicting interests that would be involved, in the throat-cutting competition that would prevail, in the bitterness that would be engendered between man and man, husband and wife, father and son, I should, of course, have no part. There would be lying and cheating, harsh treatment by masters, dishonesty of servants, strikes and lockouts, assaults and intimidation, family feuds and interminable broils; but they would not concern me. In the serene atmosphere of my earthly paradise I would be safe from all evil. I would feast on the daintiest of dishes and sip wines of the choicest vintage. My gardens would have the most magnificent terraces and finest walks. I would

roam 'mid the umbrageous foliage of the trees, the blooming flowers, the warbling of birds, the jetting of fountains and the splashing of pellucid waters. My palace would have its walls of alabaster and domes of crystal; there would be furniture of the most exquisite workmanship, carpet and hangings of the richest patterns and choicest textures, carvings and paintings that were miracles of art, vessels of gold and silver, gems of the purest ray glittering in their settings, the voluptuous strains of the sweetest music, the perfume of roses, the softest of cushions, a horde of titled lackeys to come and do my bidding and a perfect galaxy of beauty to stimulate desire and administer to my enjoyment.

THE RESULT

Thus would I pass the happy hours away, while throughout the world it would be a hallmark of respectability to extol my virtue, and anthems would be everywhere sung in my praise.

Archimedes never dreamt of anything like that. Yet with the earth for my fulcrum and its ownership for my lever, it is all possible. If it should be said that the people would eventually detect the fraud, and with swift vengeance hurl me and all my courtly parasites to perdition, I answer: Nothing of the kind; the people are as good as gold, and would stand it like bricks, and I appeal to the facts of today to bear me witness."

[EDITORIAL NOTE:—This article is reprinted from the *Standard*, the admirable Single Tax organ of Sydney, Australia. There seems little reason for doubting that it was written by Samuel Clemens (Mark Twain), but it does not appear in his collected works and Poole's Index of Periodical Literature fails to indicate it. Mr. Huie, editor of the *Standard*, informs us that it was brought to him in 1915 by J. Compton, one of the followers of the movement who has passed away.

The article is an astonishingly clever one and is certainly in the style of Mark Twain. Maybe some of our readers can indicate its origin. Incidentally it may be said that Mark Twain and Henry George were friends.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.]

PPROMISES for "conscription of wealth" in the new war are fraudulent. They are but bait for unwary opponents of war. President Hoover is sniffing at it, it may bite. He bit, it may be recalled, on the Smoot-Hawley tariff because it had the flexible provision attached as a bait. The only conscription of wealth in the next war will be like that in the last, all kinds of taxes on income and other results of labor so framed as to be very heavy on the small manufacturer and businessman while helping to create thousands of new millionaires and strengthen the old ones. Land values will not be taxed nor touched at all unless the owner sells the land for a cash profit dies. Any one who will complain about the broken promise will be sent to prison for sedition if he escapes lynching. The only way to abolish war is to abolish predatory interests and the way to abolish them is to abolish privileges such as monopoly of land, franchises, tariffs and other taxes on labor, and all special favors conferred by government on favored ones. Until this has been done war cannot be prevented.

The Taxation of Land Values

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY BY ROBERT POLLARD FOX, RICHMOND UNIVERSITY, IN THE ANNIE C. GEORGE CONTEST, 1931

THE association of progress with poverty is the great enigma of our times. It is the central fact from which spring industrial, social, and political difficulties that perplex the world, and with which statesmanship, philanthropy and education grapple in vain.

The enormous increase in productive power which has marked the last hundred years has no tendency to extirpate poverty or to lighten the burden of those compelled to toil. Inventions of all kinds have given mankind powers which were not dreamed of a century ago. Wealth has been greatly increased. Material progress has certainly been made.

But just as a community realizes the conditions which all civilized communities are striving for, so does poverty take a darker aspect. Some get a better living, but others find it hard to get any living at all.

Evidently, beneath this common occurrence we must infer a common cause. All important as this question is, it has not yet received a solution which accounts for all the facts and points to any clear and simple remedy.

Political economy is the science which, in the sequence of certain phenomena, seeks to trace mutual relations and to identify cause and effect. By the methods of political economy the cause associating poverty with progress and increasing want with advancing wealth can be found and remedied.

Poverty is not due to overpopulation. It is not due to the weakness of productive forces. In the countries where poverty is deepest, the forces of production are evidently strong enough, if fully employed, to provide for the lowest not only comfort but luxury.

Increasing population increases rent (ground rent) without reference to the natural qualities of land, for the increased powers of co-operation and exchange which come with increased population are equivalent to an increased capacity to land. The increased power which comes with increased population brings out a superior power in labor, which is localized in land.

Let us imagine an immigrant coming to the frontier to settle. He has an abundance of rich virgin soil, and all that nature affords. He has what would make him rich if he were in a populous district, but he is very poor. He has none of the advantages which a community offers. Soon other immigrants come until there is a community in which labor has an effectiveness which it could not approach in the solitary state. There are now present industrial, social and intellectual advantages.

If one would go to the first settler now and offer to buy his land for the full value of all the improvements, the settler would naturally refuse to sell. Although his land will not bring any more or better crops, it brings far more

of all the other necessities of life. The presence of other settlers—the increase of population—has added to the productiveness, which gives it a superiority over land of equal natural quality where there are yet no settlers. The value or rent of this settler's land will depend on the advantage which it has from being at the center of population.

Population continues to increase, giving greater utility to the land, and more wealth to the owner. This community becomes a city, and productive power which density of population has attached to this land is equivalent to the multiplication of its original fertility by the hundred fold. Rent, which measures the difference between this added productiveness and that of the least productive land in use, has increased accordingly. This settler or whoever has succeeded to his right in the land is now a rich man. He is rich—not from anything he has done, but from the increase of population. This increase in the value of land due to no effort on the part of the owner, but to the growth of society, is called an "unearned increment." It is a creation of the community.

Another cause which explains the influence of material progress upon the distribution of wealth is the confident expectation of the future enhancement of land values, which arises from the steady increase of rent, and which leads to speculation.

"The reason why, in spite of the increase of productive power, wages constantly tend to a minimum which will give but a bare living, is that, with increase in productive power, rent tends to even greater increase, thus producing a constant tendency to the forcing down of wages."—(Henry George, *Progress and Poverty*).

Since land is necessary to labor, and since it is reduced to private ownership, every increase in the productive power of labor increases rent—the price that labor must pay for the opportunity to utilize its power; and thus all the advantages gained by progress go to the owners of land, and wages do not increase.

The recognition of these relations explain this association of poverty with wealth, low wages with high productive power, and virtual slavery with political liberty.

The present law of taxation provides for the taxation of three kinds of property: land, improvements, and personal property. By this method a man is taxed or penalized for making improvements, while the man who leaves his land idle receives an increasing value, and is rewarded for doing nothing. A house and the lot on which it stands are alike classed as real estate, and are alike property as being the subject of ownership. Yet in nature and relations they differ widely. The one is produced by human labor and is styled wealth. The other is a part of nature and is styled land.

As labor cannot produce without the use of land, the denial of the equal right to the use of land is necessarily the denial of the right of labor to its own produce. The fundamental law of nature, that her enjoyment by man shall be consequent upon his exertion, is thus violated.

The one receives without producing; the others produce without receiving. The one is unjustly enriched; the others are robbed.

The value of land expresses in exact and tangible form the right of the community in land held by an individual; and rent expresses the exact amount which the individual should pay to the community to satisfy the equal rights of all other members of the community.

Thus, if we concede to priority of possession the undisturbed use of land, taxing rent into the public treasury for the benefit of the community, we reconcile fixity of tenure which is necessary for improvements with a full and complete recognition of equal right of all to the use of land.

By making use of existing machinery, we may, without jar or shock, assert the common right of land by appropriating rent by taxation. We already take some rent by taxation; therefore, we have only to make some changes in our modes of taxation to take it all.

In form the ownership of land would remain just as now. For rent being taken by the State in taxes, land, no matter in whose name it stood, or in what parcels it was held, would be really common property, and every member of the community would participate in the advantages of its ownership.

Now, inasmuch as the taxation of rent, or land values, must necessarily be increased just as we abolish other taxes, we may put the proposition into practical form by proposing—"To abolish all taxation save that upon land values."

It can easily be shown that a land-value tax is better than an equal tax on all property. The foundation upon which the equal taxation of all kinds of property is commonly insisted upon is that it is equally protected by the State. The basis of this idea is evidently that the enjoyment of property is made possible by the State—that there is a value created and maintained by the community, which is justly called upon to meet community expenses. Now, of what value is this true? Only of the value of land. This is a value that does not arise until a community is formed, and that, unlike other values, grows only with the growth of the community. It exists only as a community exists.

The tax upon land values is, therefore, the most just and equal of all taxes. It falls only upon those who receive from society a peculiar and valuable benefit, and upon them in proportion to the benefit they receive. It is the taking by the community of that value which is the creation of the community. It is the application of the common property to common uses. When all rent is taken by taxation on land values for the need of the community, then will the equality ordained by nature be attained. Then, but not till then, will labor get its full reward, and capital its natural return.

Some have declared taxes on the rent of land to be impolitic and unjust because the return received from the

natural and inherent powers of the soil cannot be clearly distinguished from the improvements and meliorations, which might thus be discouraged. But admitting that it is impossible in some few cases to separate the value of the land from the value of the improvements, is this necessity of continuing to tax some improvements any reason why we should continue to tax all improvements?

But the value of land can usually be readily distinguished from the value of improvements. In many of the States the value of the land and the value of improvements are habitually estimated separately, though afterward reunited under the term of real estate. Frequently the land is owned by one person and the buildings by another, and when a fire occurs and improvements are destroyed a clear and definite value remains in the land.

The advantages of the Single Tax will appear more important the more they are considered. The present method of taxation operates upon energy, industry, skill, and thrift like a fine upon those qualities. To abolish these present taxes would be to lift the whole enormous weight of taxation from productive industry.

To shift the burden of taxation from production and exchange to the value or rent of land would not merely be to give new stimulus to the production of wealth; it would be to open new opportunities. For under this system no one would care to hold land unless to use it, and land now withheld from use would everywhere be thrown open to improvement.

The selling price of land would fall; land speculation would receive its death blow; land monopolization would no longer pay. Everywhere that land had attained a value taxation, instead of operating as now, as a fine upon improvements, would operate to force improvements.

Consider the effect of such a change upon the labor market. Competition would no longer be one-sided. In stead of laborers competing with each other for employment, and cutting down wages to the point of bare subsistence, employers would be competing for laborers, and wages would rise to the fair earnings of labor. For into the market would have entered the greatest of all the competitors of labor—the demand for labor itself.

To relieve labor and capital of all taxation, and to throw the burden upon rent, would be, as far as it went, to counteract the tendency of inequality of wealth, and it went so far as to take in taxation the whole of rent, the cause of inequality would be totally destroyed. Rent instead of causing inequality, as now, would promote equality. Labor and capital would then receive the whole produce, minus that portion taken by the State in the taxation of land values, which, being applied to public purposes, would be equally distributed in public benefit.

Some land holders take the alarm when the Single Tax on land is mentioned, but this proposition commends itself to all whose interests as land holders do not exceed the interests as laborers or capitalists, or both, and although the large land holders may lose relatively, yet even in the

case there will be an absolute gain. For the increase in production will be so great that labor and capital will gain much more than will be lost to private land ownership, while in these gains, and in the greater ones involved in a more healthy social condition, the whole community, including the land owners themselves, will share.

The farmer would be a great gainer by the Single Tax, because the taxation of land values would fall with greatest weight, not upon the agricultural districts, where land values are comparatively small, but upon towns and cities where land values are high. In sparsely settled districts there would be hardly any taxes at all for the farmer to pay.

The Single Tax would have a great beneficial effect upon social ideals. Poverty, the relentless hell, which lies beneath civilized society would disappear along with all of its degrading consequences. Give labor a free field, and take for the benefit of the whole community that fund which the growth of the community creates, and want and fear of want would be gone. The springs of production would be set free, and the enormous increase of wealth with a more equal distribution would give the poorest ample comfort. Men would no more worry about finding employment. The progress of science, the march of invention, the diffusion of knowledge, would bring their benefits to all. Equal privilege would be given to all and special privilege to none.

YOU are holding a tract of land out of use on speculation. A long continued depression finally makes you despair of getting your price. You decide to accept a much lower offer from a man who would employ others in using this land. You are about to close the deal when you hear from what you believe a reliable source that "better times are coming next week." Will not your natural reaction be to call off the deal unless next week's price—or what you believe to be next week's price—be paid? And will not the probable effect of this be to prevent the sale and leave the men who were about to be employed in the jobless ranks? Then are such pollyanna predictions as led you to stop the sale a good or bad thing for business? When believed are they likely to bring better times or postpone them? Would it not help more to face the truth and admit it?

PITY our poor statesmen and professional economists who have to face the terrible problem of how to feed the unemployed. What makes it particularly hard to solve is that at the same time the country is suffering from "overproduction." And then on top of all comes the news that farmers are still raising immense crops of wheat and the question of what to do with this wheat is piled on them before they have found a way to feed the starving. How can any group possibly have brains enough to solve all these knotty problems?

Alexander Hamilton In British Columbia

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY HIM BEFORE
THE HENRY GEORGE SOCIETY OF
VICTORIA, B. C., JUNE 19, 1931

IHAVE recently returned from a visit to Eugene, Ore. I addressed a meeting in the Congregational Church Forum there on the partial application of Henry George's principles in British Columbia. I also spoke in Portland and in Seattle, at the Commonwealth Club, the Lyel Club, and to the Municipal League.

Eugene, the capital of Lane County, Ore., is a fine city of 20,000 people, situated in the upper Willamette Valley. Many of the streets are paved, beautifully boulevarded and planted with shade trees. There has been no snow all winter and flowers have been blooming gayly. The chief industries of the neighborhood are farming, fruit growing and lumbering. Being a university city and having some liberal churches with forums, one can listen at any time to addresses on social, psychological, scientific, economic, religious and kindred subjects. * * * Prices of commodities average much less than on the Canadian side of the line, so that Eugene may be quite truly called a city of cheap living and high thinking, and altogether a most desirable place in which to live.

The Oregonians have an advantage over us in the matter of keeping their politicians in order. They have a referendum law that works; we have one that is unworkable. Eight per cent. of the voters may demand a referendum. Here we require 25 per cent. If their representatives attempt to raise their own salaries or give undue privileges to corporations or such like, the referendum can easily be invoked to head them off, while we have to take that sort of thing lying down. When direct legislation became law too many questions were "referred" for settlement at each election and cluttered up the ballot, but the measure is now considered well past the experimental stage.

I have referred to the fact that living is cheaper on the south side of the international boundary. Protectionists, of course, claim that this, like all other good things, is to be credited to the policy of high tariff. It will be news to some people to hear that free trade is the actual cause, but such is undoubtedly the case. It is true that Americans have a very high tariff wall against the outside world, but here is a world within itself. Forty-eight great commonwealths, many of them large and prosperous enough to be classed as nations, unlimited natural resources, variety of climate and products, 120,000,000 progressive, inventive and hustling people and unrestricted reciprocity—absolute free trade across all boundary lines. Trade is free coming and free going. * * *

The United States of America constitutes within herself the greatest experiment in free trade the world has ever seen. I do not say they would not benefit immensely

by free trade with the outside world. Let them adopt even a "revenue" policy and overnight almost her flag would be seen on every sea and in every harbor on earth.

What I do say is that while so great a nation may rub along in spite of a protective policy, the same policy practiced by such a country with only a twelfth of the population would be quite suicidal. * * *

All trade is at bottom barter—the exchange of commodities for commodities. Therefore, as Canada has unlimited commodities of a limited variety to sell, her only trade policy is to remove obstructions to the inflow of commodities. Added to other advantages this would lower the cost of commodities and lessen the endless outflowing tide of Canadians seeking enlarged opportunities and cheaper living conditions in the United States.

It may be asked: If the United States grew and became great under protection, why cannot Canada do likewise? The answer is that the United States was great before her tariff wall was built so high as it is today. Her tariff has only been high since Civil War times. * * *

The greatest mistake made by both the United States and Canada was in alienating most of their land and natural resources to a few monopolists. Nothing would have been more disastrous. Even the benefits of free trade like all other benefits, must ultimately be absorbed by those who hold the key to nature's bounties—the landlords. The words of Henry George in his lecture on "Moses" still fit as well as they did in the year 1884:

"Yet the great concern of Moses was with the duty that lay plainly before him: the effort to lay the foundations of a social state in which deep poverty and degrading want should be unknown—where men released from the meaner struggles that waste human energy should have opportunity for intellectual and moral development.

"Here stands out the greatness of the man. What was the wisdom and stretch of forethought that in the desert sought to guard in advance against the dangers of a settled state, let the present speak.

"In the full blaze of the nineteenth century, when every child in our schools may know as common truths things of which the Egyptian sages never dreamed, when the earth has been mapped and the stars have been weighed, when steam and electricity have been pressed into service and science is wresting from nature secret after secret—it is but natural to look back upon the wisdom of three thousand years ago as the man looks back upon the learning of the child.

"And yet, for all this wonderful increase of knowledge, for all this enormous gain of productive power, where is the country in the civilized world in which today there is not want and suffering—where the masses are not condemned to toil that gives no leisure, and all classes are not pursued by a greed of gain that makes life an ignoble struggle to get and to keep. Three thousand years of advance, and still the moan goes up 'They have made our lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar and brick, and in all manner of service'! Three thousand years of advance! and the piteous voices of little children are in the moan.

"We progress and we progress, we girdle continents with iron roads and knit cities together with the mesh of telegraph wires, each day brings some new invention, each year marks a fresh advance—the power of production increased and the avenues of exchange cleared and broadened, yet the complaint of 'hard times' is louder and louder; everywhere men are harassed by care and haunted by the fear of want. With swift, steady strides and prodigious leaps the power of human

hands to satisfy human wants advances and advances, is multiplied and multiplied. Yet the struggle for mere existence is more and more intense and human labor is becoming the cheapest of commodities. Beside glutted warehouses human beings grow faint with hunger and shiver with cold; under the shadow of churches festers the vice that is born of want.

"Trace to their root the causes that are thus producing want in the midst of plenty, ignorance in the midst of intelligence, aristocracy in democracy, weakness in strength—that are giving to our civilization a one-sided and unstable development, and you will find it something which this Hebrew statesman three thousand years ago perceived and guarded against. Moses saw that the real cause of enslavement of the masses of Egypt was, what has everywhere produced enslavement—the possession by a class of the land upon which and from which the whole people must live. He saw that to permit in land the same unqualified ownership that by natural right attaches to things produced by labor would be inevitably to separate the people into the very rich and the very poor—inevitably to enslave labor—to make the few masters of the many, no matter what the political forms, to bring vice and degradation no matter what the religion.

"And with the foresight of the philosophic statesman who legislates not for the needs of a day, but for all the future, he sought, in way suited to his times and conditions, to guard against this error. Everywhere in the Mosaic institutions is the land treated as the gift of the Creator to His common creatures, which no one has the right to monopolize. Everywhere it is, not your estate or your property, not the land which you bought or the land which you conquered, but 'the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee!—the land which the Lord lendeth thee. And the practical legislation, by regulations to which he gave the highest sanctions, he tried to guard against the wrong that converted ancient civilizations into despotisms—the wrong that in after centuries ate out the heart of Rome, that produced the inbruting serfdom of Poland and the gaunt misery of Ireland."

In the forty-seven years since the above eloquent words were spoken larger fortunes than ever have been rolled up; ground rent (the community value) has enormously increased and is still pocketed by a few, and unemployment has become chronic. Conditions are becoming more intolerable and menacing. The cause being fundamental no superficial remedy can avail. The axe must be laid to the root of the tree.

It is startling to note the similarity between Rome in her decline and the world in its present plight. She also had her unemployment problem, the dole and miles of tables to feed the starving. It is plain that a system based on injustice cannot endure. We must avoid Rome's fatal error or take the consequences. Public values must be appropriated for public purposes, and privately produced values be sacredly left to the producer.

Civilizations have risen and fallen—fallen, no doubt, because of the uneven distribution of wealth and power, selfishness on the one hand and ignorance on the other. History tells us that "land monopoly ruined Rome," and it is clear and plain to those who are capable of ordinary observation that the same evil is rapidly ruining Anglo-Saxon civilization. Men in the mass, locked out from natural opportunities, invariably become as helpless chattel slaves.

Science tells us that for the next million years or more this globe may be doing duty in the same old orbit, and

human life and human comfort and wellbeing, as far as natural law is concerned, be as possible as ever.

The question is, Shall we go on treading in the footsteps of Rome, assuredly to meet Rome's fate, or shall we be wise enough to abolish monopoly and privilege by discarding Rome's quiritary system of land tenure and secure for countless future generations the right to liberty, fair play and equal opportunity as envisioned by the nineteenth century "Prophet of San Francisco"?

The Tax Cannot Be Shifted

SOME disappointment may be felt at the fact that the tax will not begin to operate until two years hence, but it is evident that the Chancellor has made up his mind to have actually in existence an effective valuation of the land before the tax begins to be collected. It may be observed also that the mere anticipation of it is already beginning to have an economic effect. A few days after the Budget statement, I met a prominent London Estate agent, who complained bitterly about the Land Value Tax and how it was going to raise rents. In the next breath he told me that he was dealing with a site for which owners had been asking £800,000 and that the Budget had knocked £50,000 off its value. I suggested to him that if the purchaser paid so much less he would not require to charge any higher rent in spite of the Land Tax value, and in fact would not be able to do so.

Alderman F. C. R. DOUGLAS in *London News*.

Land Value Taxation In Britain

IN fulfilment of his oft-repeated promises Mr. Snowden provided, in his recent budget proposals, for land values taxation. The proposal, 1d in the £, is very small indeed, but it touches the "Ark of the Covenant," and will create a firstclass row. If any one has doubts about the fact of the Land Question being at the root of all social problems, the very tap root of Privilege, let him ponder on the rumpus that will take place on these taxes, and ask why the whole of the agencies of privilege should lash themselves into such fury over 1d in the £ on land values. They will rumble and growl for a little while, but they will swallow any other taxes. But not so with land value taxes. Tax the people's food and clothing and any other vital necessities, and the privileged classes will shout hooray. But crape a paring off their privileges and they will have paroxysms of frenzy, during which they will resort to anything to retain their grip. We may expect shortly to hear of another Zinovieff letter, or something of that nature. However, if the privileged classes want fight the "land for the people" and "publicly-created values for public purposes" is a first-class issue for a Labor party and a Liberal party to take to the country. Later on we shall be able to supply information to our readers on the great issue, free from the Tory taint of cabled news and the distorted views of special correspondents of the Tory press.

Sydney, (N. S. W.), *Standard*.

Causes of Depressions

BY CHARLES G. MERRELL

A FEW weeks ago, at a druggists' meeting, one of the members finished his talk for the day with a rather sad picture of the unemployed during the last year. Here we are, in a land of plenty, of natural resources and of accumulated wealth beyond the dreams of our forefathers, and yet we have on all sides distress that, if it were laid bare for all to see in its fullness, would shock the hearts of the strongest men. And yet, when he came to a consideration of what was to be done about it, he threw up his hands in utter despair and knew not even what to suggest.

The noted economist Roger Babson, at about the same time, evidently felt a depression of mind and spirit and tried to express it by copying in one of his reports a few verses by Marion L. Ulmer, originally published in *The Congregationalist*:

THE UNEMPLOYED

His thin face haunted me—my mind said "Why?"

Yet something in my heart made me ashamed

That I was warmed and fed and safely housed,

While he, disheartened, cheerless, sought a "job."

The unemployed—but we are not to blame.

Or are we not? Aye, well we know our guilt

Is strong upon our soul, that any man,

Wanting and willing, hungers still and needs.

Lay on our hearts, O Father Life of All,

The burden of these men, until we feel

Their helpless wings abeat 'gainst prison walls

The greatness of our social structure raised.

For not in any canting words of creed

But in the fibre of our life we feel

The pain of every sick, disheartened soul—

The price and glory of our brotherhood!

And yet in all of his reports I have yet to see from Babson, or any other economist of note, an explanation of the situation, or a remedy for it. He does warn against increasing the load of taxation, but how to bring this about with decreasing returns from the usual sources and increasing needs for relief work is something he does not attempt to answer.

"OVERPRODUCTION" VS. "OVERPREDICTION"

We hear on the one hand that overproduction is the cause of our present difficulties, and on the other hand that the demonetization of silver in India and other countries, together with the scarcity of gold or its proper distribution, is somehow the explanation of all the trouble. In between these major causes (as explained by our publicists) are numerous other explanations for the greatest depression in the history of our country and the unemployment situation that is a disgrace to those who attempt to guide the destinies of this great nation.

Will Rogers once made the pertinent remark that what this country was suffering from was not overproduction but "overprediction," and so I am not going to add to the

suffering of my fellow men by making more than one prediction, which is that unless there is a marked change in the course upon which the ship of state is sailing, the next depression will be worse than the last, as has been the case in each instance over the past twenty years; and while it is about as dangerous to one's reputation for sanity, in these days of organized mass psychology, to point out errors in the existing order as it is to make predictions for the future, I am going to give myself the satisfaction of doing this very thing.

Now let us consider this great problem of unemployment. In a normal state of affairs how can there be any such thing as unemployment? In the final analysis what is employment but the application of labor to land? From such application all wealth is produced. It may be true, in a spiritual sense, that "the harvest is ready but the laborers are few," but when we talk of unemployment, does anyone even suggest that the starving millions are unwilling to work? No, the great cry is, "There is no work," and at the same time there is no bread for those who have not the money to pay for it. And yet there are millions of bushels of grain for which there is no market. How can such a paradox be?

Let us examine this problem carefully. Man is born on earth, and as he cannot live in the air or in the sea, he must live on the earth as long as he lives in this world. Our forefathers used terms more in their original sense: A freeman was not only one who was not a slave or a serf but a freeholder of the land he lived on and worked for his living, and only such a man possessed the right to vote.

We in this great country of ours delight to expatiate on the fact that all men are free and all can vote, even the women. What an anomaly! All men can vote, but all cannot work for a living!

FREE TO VOTE, BUT NOT TO WORK!

Let us put certain facts in juxtaposition and see if it throws any light on the problem: starving men on one side, unused grain on the other—idle men and idle acres. Let a child tell the answer. Bring the starving men to the unused grain, put the idle men on the idle acres. Is not that the obvious answer? But this cannot be done just because of one thing: the land on which the grain was grown and the idle acres are no more free than are the idle men who have produced the grain and are starving today.

All wealth in its final analysis is produced by the application of labor to land. That which we call "capital" is no more nor less than the stored and unused products of "labor." Millions of people who are now out of employment are willing to work. If you had gone with me into the Western country years ago you would not have found a single individual not earning his own living.

Now, just what was the difference in the West forty years ago and the conditions we find here in Cincinnati today? I read in the *Cincinnati Post* not long ago of a panic that occurred here, back in 1840, in which Jacob Burnet,

after whom an earlier popular hotel was named, lost his entire fortune of \$80,000. He went out in the woods with an ax to cut cord wood at \$1.50 a cord, kept his family alive and afterward re-established his fortune. Now, who could do that today? Just imagine anyone of us going out fifteen or even a hundred miles from Cincinnati and cutting cord wood off any piece of property! You know as well as I do that anyone who tried it would simply add one more to the population of the county jail. Or suppose one of these unemployed today might have read about the Irish people having lived on potatoes for years, and thought last spring that that would be a good thing for him to do to tide his family over a hard winter. I live only ten miles from the city, and on my way home I pass acres and acres of unused land. Suppose such a man had come out to some of these unused acres last year with the idea of planting potatoes to keep his family from starving. How far do you imagine he would get with his plowing?

The ownership of the earth today is concentrated in the hands of a very few men to whom the unemployed must go for permission to use the land, or even for their very existence. The Creator made the whole earth; man never made an acre nor did he individually create a dollar of the enormous value at which the land of this country is held today. The value of land is made by the community and in fact the value attaches not to the land itself but to the site which it occupies.

"SITE VALUE," NOT QUALITY OF LAND

The value of a single acre of land in New York City is about \$40,000,000. This is possibly not as good land as some up the State which can be bought for \$200. If you could remove the ten million people from Metropolitan area that acre of New York City land would probably be less valuable than the acre of farm land up the State. So it is not the *quality* of land that determines the price but it is the *site value* which is made by the community.

When Jacob Schmidlapp as president of the Union Trust Company put up the building at the corner of Fourth and Walnut Streets—the first skyscraper in the City of Cincinnati—every citizen was proud of the fact that at last Cincinnati had come into its own and was beginning to progress. And when someone expressed this thought to Mr. Schmidlapp, he replied, in effect: "That is very nice but you people have fined me \$200,000 for doing this. On the opposite corner with practically the same advantage of location as mine is an old rattle-trap of a building which you are ashamed and yet the owner is rewarded by low taxes, \$150,000 less than I must pay. This old building occupies a corner just as important and as valuable as the one on which we have erected the new building. If the taxes had been on the land value only and we would cease placing a penalty upon putting up attractive buildings in the city, the owner of the old building would have been compelled to erect a building appropriate to the site which he occupies, or sell to the Emery Estate, which

wanted to extend the Mercantile Library building to Fourth Street. Instead of that, our system of taxation encourages this land owner to hold his land out of use and to profit by an increased value which was made by his fellow citizens and which he had done nothing to create."

And so we encourage idle men and idle acres, and inevitably at almost regular periods we have a business depression and the problem of unemployment. Instead of encouraging the proper use of land as against the land speculation of today, the tendency seems to be to reduce, if possible, the taxation on land values and thus encourage further speculation; to raise more and more taxes on industry and, like Pharaoh of old, lay heavy burdens, grievous to be borne, on thrift and honesty. Instead of encouraging industry and thrift we penalize these homely virtues and encourage speculation. And so we have the extremes of society, the idle rich and the idle poor, and a diminishing proportion of the middle class who are the bulwark of society.

LAND VALUE IS COMMUNITY-MADE

Our theory of taxation is fundamentally wrong. It is based upon the ability to pay instead of requiring payment by the individual for the privileges and services which he receives from the government.

Land value is a community made value, and an adequate rental for the use of the location belongs to the community by the same fundamental law that ought to make the property created by man through the labor of his own hands inviolable against taxation.

Let us see by illustration how unjust is the present method of taxing private property. Let us assume that "A" and "B" each earns a hundred dollars a week. One of them spends all of it and the other saves \$25,000 in the course of years. Now we fine, or tax, the thrifty man on his savings, but the extravagant man goes untaxed so far as private wealth is concerned, for he has none. By what right in equity or in common sense do we say to the one who has saved \$25,000, "You must support the government; your neighbor hasn't anything, so you must pay double to make up the deficiency. You are able to pay and he is not." Can anyone imagine that this plan encourages thrift and industry? And yet our Legislatures are today trying to devise schemes to lay heavy burdens upon those who have through thrift and industry laid by a little for "a rainy day." Is it not a natural sequence that we now have a demand for old-age pensions and other socialistic propositions? But if our taxing systems were correct and justice prevailed, there would be no possible argument or need for old-age pensions and similar schemes.

"TAX THE RICH!"

Tax the rich is a popular cry. Law making bodies respond to the cry by creating super taxes on incomes, etc. One is justified in asking by what right they do this. Does the fact that I have ten times as much wealth as you indicate that I receive ten times more public benefit? A proper

system of taxation should only levy taxes according to benefits conferred. When you receive benefits, this makes you a debtor to the one who confers the benefit—in this case "the taxing powers." All do not receive benefits alike. If they did, then a head tax, the same on all, would be a proper tax.

Now let us consider this question of taxation in connection with its origin and relation to its incidence. When Daniel Boone and Thomas Lincoln settled in Kentucky and built their log cabins near each other there were no taxes. There was nothing to spend them for. But when more people settled in the community and wanted a schoolhouse, a church, and then by degrees some of the other forms of community service, it became necessary to raise funds. It also became desirable to live near the center of the town where the schoolhouse and other conveniences were located. Rather than have his children walk a mile or more to school, a man would rather pay a little more than his childless neighbor. A man who lived five miles away, on the other hand, would not expect to contribute as heavily to the community programme as those who lived in close proximity. Hence there arose "land values" where there were never any before; but these were not intrinsic *land* values but *site* values. Now, it is a remarkable thing that as the community expenses grew these site values increased in almost direct proportion, in fact even in excess of the community needs, and if the actual rental of these site values had been taken from the outset, no individual would have lost a penny that was his by virtue of his own efforts, nor would he have contributed anything out of the products of his labor, and yet there would have been ample funds to support all governmental uses from the values created by the services rendered by the government. There would have been no taxation today in the sense that we now have it. The communal values would have remained and have accrued to the community, and each occupant of the site would have paid into the community the actual rental of that site and nothing more.

THE BUILDER PENALIZED TEN TIMES

He could have built a satisfactory home, could have added to it as his family needs increased: he could even have painted it once a year and he would have had to pay the builder or the painter and would not have to pay the government over again for the same house as we do today.

Let us see how our present system works out. A street is planned as an extension from an existing roadway; people begin to build houses here and there along this roadway of, let us say, a mile in extent; let us assume that these lots sell for \$1,000 apiece and that the average house built costs \$9,000. In the one case the man who has a lot idle has a \$1,000 investment, and the man who improves his property by building a house has a \$10,000 investment. If the tax is 3 per cent, the one pays \$300, whereas the other pays \$30. The city then improves the street, lays down a sewer and water mains, extends police and fire

protection. All of these services are available equally to those who have built houses and those who have not, but those who have built houses and thereby improved the site value of all the property pay ten times as much for their service as those who have not built a house, and yet it costs the city just as much to run the sewer, water mains and other services past the unimproved lot as it does past the lot on which stands a house; in fact it costs the city twice as much if only 50 per cent of the lots are built upon, as these services have to run a mile instead of a half mile, which would have accommodated the houses that are now built. Even the services that are rendered by private companies, so-called public utility companies, cost twice as much as they should because there is no way of serving those who have houses without running these services past the vacant lots. Yet the fact that these services run past these vacant lots adds to their value, but those who have built houses have to pay most of the cost.

It may not be clearly seen how all this has a direct bearing upon unemployment and recurrent depressions, but it ought to be clear that our present system discourages thrift and industry, increases the cost of government out of proportion to the services rendered or actually used, takes from the thrifty and industrious a large share of what they produce, and gives to idle-land owners the unearned increment of site values which were created and belong to the community and which alone ought to be taken in taxation for support of government. Our present system encourages holding idle land out of use, depriving those who are willing to work of the opportunity. A living wage could be established, not as at present, on the bare cost of subsistence, but by what each man could earn by the application of his labor to land which would be acceptable to all, and no one would be compelled to work for another at a lower rate than he could earn by his own industry freely employed.

HOPEFUL SIGNS

It is a hopeful sign, therefore, to read in the daily papers that there are other factors to be considered ere we acquire stabilization of prosperity and an end of unemployment crisis: "It means long, hard study, the scrapping of much tradition, a new openmindedness on the part of industrial and political leaders. It is a challenge to the best brains and the highest courage of American industry. But it is a challenge that must be met. The alternative is disaster."

This sounds very like the following statement by Dictator Stalin of Soviet Russia, who was reported in the *New York Times* to have said: "The economic depression will get worse. It is not, however, the culminating crisis. Capitalism will recover, this time, but a second and worse crisis will thereafter develop, and then another, because the capitalist system is in progressive decay."

Although the similarity of the two statements is apparent, the first one, be it noted, is from the conservative *Cleveland Plain Dealer*. Another statement from the *Wash-*

ington Evening Star is along the same lines: "The knowledge that the worst is over is scant comfort if it means that the climb to another peak must be followed by a descent even more rapid, and to lower levels, than the past. The chief problem before the nation today is to fill up the swamps and morasses of depression in advance, and to prevent the repetition of such figures as those just revealed."

In my humble judgment neither Stalin nor these financial writers in the United States have found or are likely to find a solution to the problem. Stalin is against what he calls "capitalism," and our American writers are all for it. Even our recognized authorities on political economy use terms so indefinitely that their statements are very confusing. There is nothing wrong with capitalism if we use the term in its proper sense. Capital is essential to progress. As has been pointed out, it is nothing more than the stored products of labor. Many in industry, using capital as the basis of their business, have found to their sorrow that capital suffers with labor in these economic depressions. Stalin and our economists in this country both confuse capitalism with privilege resulting from our land system; but the two are distinct and indeed antagonistic. The interests of capital are the same as the interests of labor because they derive from the same source. There is no natural conflict between capital and labor; they should join hands to take away the burden which has been imposed upon both by land monopoly.

Only intense prejudice and economic blindness stand in the way. The hope of the future lies in enlightenment on the part of both capital and labor, whose common enemy is the land monopolist, and it is my thought tonight that the source of our difficulties can be overcome by a reform in taxation. This can only be instituted when the evils of the present system are recognized and there is a general desire for improvement on the part of those who are most affected.

"Why," you may ask, "do not more people see and desire the benefits to be derived from the taxation of site values only?" The answer is simply this: Those who think (whose thought influences the destiny of the country) have not suffered, and those who suffer cannot think!

Cincinnati, Ohio.

NEW York Socialists are organizing a party branch to consist entirely of deaf voters. Nevertheless Congressman Hamilton Fish has not yet joined.

"THE world will make a beaten path to the door of the man who makes a better mouse trap, though he live in a wilderness." What a fine thing that will be for the owners of land along that beaten path. They will get millions in unearned increment and the federal government will not think of putting a tax on the land value they grab. But the poor maker of a better mouse trap! How it will soak him with income taxes!

Progress And Poverty

BY NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

A PART OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, JUNE 2, 1931

IT is a full half century since no inconsiderable part of the world was plunged into vigorous and often excited controversy over the thesis and the arguments of a book by Henry George. He called it "Progress and Poverty." The very title was abundant in challenge, and the argument of the book was more challenging still. Henry George pressed the question as to why it is that with all the vaunted progress that society has made and is making, there should still be so much poverty and want, and such apparently permanent lines of division between the great mass of those who prosper and the great mass of those who do not. While Henry George lived and met the public face to face upon the platform, his vigorous personality gained him many followers and made many advocates of his opinions. The years that have passed have set his economic analysis and economic teaching in due perspective and enable us now to consider them with a just sense of their permanent importance and with regard to the soundness of their underlying principles.

It may be said at once that so far as Henry George pointed to privilege as an unbecoming, unfair and indeed disastrous accompaniment of progress, his teaching has passed into economic theory everywhere. Sound economists in every land accept and support economic equality and economic opportunity as fundamental. Not many economists of high rank, however, accept Henry George's thesis that land-holding is the one particular kind of privilege whose limitation or destruction should be brought about. The tendency has been rather to look upon the inequality of conditions which arise from land-holding as only one factor, and perhaps a minor one, of the very serious and much larger problem to which Henry George so earnestly pointed.

Once again, therefore, as so often before in the history of thought, we find that a popular preacher and teacher has seized upon a fundamental fact of large importance and brought it with eloquence and zeal to public attention, but has not been able to convince men that he could point the way out of the difficulties and dangers whose existence he so clearly saw.

Today in every part of the world, and much more vigorously than a half century ago, this same question is being pressed upon the attention of mankind. Why is that progress in which we take such pride, so uncertain, and indeed so inconsequent, in meeting not only the hopes but the needs of so many human beings? Where are we to look for the cause and the cure of that distress which is so widespread in the world, for which poverty is only one name? Science and the practical applications of science have within a few decades revolutionized the practical conditions of life. They have almost destroyed the effects of distance

in space and time, and they have cast the interests of men, however remotely they may be placed, in a common mould. Yet immense masses of food material are produced, now in the United States, now in Argentina, now in the valley of the Danube, and no market is found for them, while not far away thousands upon thousands of human beings are in want of food. The material means with which to satisfy every human desire and to afford every human comfort can now be produced in quantities hitherto unknown and at costs most moderate, and yet so many of those who need these things desperately cannot possibly acquire them.

These are all familiar facts. They have been stated over and over again. The only possible reason for restating them is that nothing adequate or even earnest is being done in regard to the grave matters to which they relate. Repetition is perhaps the only way by which a sluggish, a self-centered and a somnolent public opinion can be stirred to look deeply into these questions before it is too late.

Too late for what? Too late to stem the tide of discontent, of disorder and of political and economic revolution. Great masses of men will not indefinitely sit quietly by and see themselves and those dependent upon them reduced to penury and want, while that which we call civilization has so much to offer, commands such stupendous resources and seems capable of accomplishing almost anything.

[EDITORIAL NOTE.—We are grateful to President Butler for his revealing pronouncement on Henry George and his teachings. An analysis of President Butler's statement fails to disclose anything to which we could take exception. We know it to be true that "not many economists of high rank accept George's thesis," but we should reply, just as Dr. Butler himself does, that "often before a popular preacher who has seized upon a fact of fundamental importance fails to convince men that he could point the way out of the difficulties and dangers whose existence" he not merely *thought* he saw but "clearly saw."

The Single Tax movement may well be congratulated on this statement from the president of Columbia, the greatest university in the world—a declaration which will open wider to us the doors of seats of learning the world over.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.]

THERE has been no prosperity. I have crossed and re-crossed this miscellaneous and scattered country of ours again and again during the last decade, and never have I seen a time when the man of the soil was not at a pinch. Never have I seen a time when there were not unemployed. Never have I seen a time when there were not people underfed, and poorly clothed; and, let any man ask himself how there can be overproduction when some lack the necessities of life.

CHAS. J. FINGER, in *All's Well*, Fayetteville, Ark.

WOULD it be a reasonable thing to ask kindergarten pupils to solve a problem in calculus? Then why demand an extra session of Congress to solve the unemployment problem?

Report of Lectures of James R. Brown

FROM MAY 26 TO JULY 19

THE summer is an inactive period for lecture work as compared with the winter months. But it will be seen from the following report that I have not been idle.

May 26—Mineola, L. I.; Chamber of Commerce; a good group of sincere men, fifty in number.

May 27—Nyack, N. Y.; Lions' Club, at noon; twenty-five present; my fourth address in Nyack.

Wappingers Falls, N. Y.; Chamber of Commerce, evening; fifty present; interesting meeting; many leading citizens present; a most agreeable and profitable evening.

June 2—Port Chester, N. Y.; Men's Club of the Methodist Church, the Rev. F. F. Voorhees, pastor. I first met Mr. Voorhees at Jackson Heights, when he had charge of the Methodist church there. Then he moved to Babylon and had me down there to speak to a men's group. It was a satisfactory and encouraging meeting, about thirty present.

June 10—Beacon, N. Y.; Kiwanis Club; very earnest, sincere men; a hearty invitation to come back and go on with the argument; forty-five present; newspapers gave generous space.

June 11—Northport, N. Y.; Thursday Club, 3 P. M.; some thirty present: an organization made up of the leading women of the neighborhood. Meeting was arranged by Miss Charlotte Schetter, and it was a group of fine women who seemed greatly interested in the doctrine.

That evening a very nice group of about twenty neighbors met in Miss Schetter's studio. This meeting was interesting and profitable.

June 14—Free Acres, N. J.; meeting held in the open air and arranged by Miss Ami Mali Hicks; about thirty present. An interesting outcome of this, showing the strength of the appeal the Single Tax has when plainly stated, was that at a meeting of the members of the Free Acre Colony the other day a resolution was passed authorizing a contribution to the Manhattan Single Tax Club each year in appreciation of the lecture, and another evidence of appreciation was the naming of a road "Henry George."

June 17—Saratoga Springs, N. Y.; Rotary Club; about seventy present. A satisfactory meeting. Our good friend George Foster Peabody attended this meeting and introduced the speaker. The meeting was all one could ask for, pleasant, friendly, agreeable in attitude and showing a desire to know more, evidenced by requests for literature.

June 18—Utica, N. Y.; Exchange Club; the fifth address I have given in Utica. It was interesting; the group friendly and open-minded. About fifty present.

June 22—Luzerne, N. Y.; Hadley-Luzerne High School commencement exercises; about 500 in attendance; meeting arranged for by Principal of High School, L. F. Perkins. I first met Mr. Perkins when he was teaching in Syracuse University; he heard a number of the lectures and ever since has been tremendously interested in the Single Tax. He is a man of sterling qualities, splendid type of mind, and one who has an unselfish relationship to his fellow-kind. I have a great admiration and affection for him. The title of my address was "Civic Righteousness." In this address I showed the dual nature of man: he is an individual; he is also a social animal, and there can be no civic righteousness without a righteous way of raising public revenue.

June 24—Newark, N. Y.; Lions' Club; my second visit to this delightful club; some fifty men present at the luncheon, and greater interest could not have been shown or a more hearty, cordial invitation to come back.

June 25—Glens Falls, N. Y.; Rotary Club, at noon; about 100 pres-

ent; my seventh visit to Glens Falls, and the fourth to the Rotary Club meeting was arranged by our good friend George H. Cless, Jr. I first met Mr. Cless in Portsmouth, Va., when I delivered an address for the Rotary Club there in 1926. He was then the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, a position he now holds in Glens Falls. When the meeting was over he stepped out to the door with me and earnestly shook hands and said, "Well, Mr. Brown, this is the greatest speech ever made in this town." I said, "why do you say that?" "Well," he said, "it is the most fundamental talk I have ever listened to and it has changed my whole outlook on life." Mr. Cless is a graduate of the Ohio State University, a very bright, keen and alert man, with a soul that is in tune with the Infinite. He arranged quite a number of meetings for me in Portsmouth, Va.; I lectured there seven times. We have the leading newspapers owner there committed absolutely to the Single Tax; he prints everything we write for him, and in Glens Falls Mr. Cless is exercising a splendid, broadening, liberalizing influence.

Luzerne, N. Y.; Grange, June 25, evening; a group of farmer folks twenty-eight in number. I like to talk to farmers; I know farmers; I have followed the plow, and many a blister I have raised on my heel walking after a harrow across a newly plowed field. There is a tremendous appeal in a farmer audience to me, overworked, underpaid, suffering all the disadvantages of our so-called civilized life. No wonder they are behind on the tax question, but they are good, honest people to talk to and unselfish. I feel they are my people, and to talk to them and to lead them into a clearer understanding of the tax problem is a great privilege.

June 26—Luzerne, N. Y.; another Grange; about thirty present kind reception and close attention.

June 29—Salem, N. Y.; Lions' Club; a group of about forty-five interested, earnest citizens. The same hearty invitation to return, the same keen interest awakened as in other places.

July 2—Bridgeton, N. J.; Rotary Club, at noon; forty-seven present; a splendid group of fellows, a great pleasure to talk to them.

Bridgeton, N. J.; Kiwanis Club, the same evening; forty-five present. Both these meetings were very, very satisfactory; arrangements that I should talk to both clubs on the same day were made by mutual agreement.

July 5—New York, N. Y.; radio talk over Station WHAP; this began a series of Sunday talks during July and August, from 10 to 10:30 P. M. Out of these talks we have already received quite a number of requests for literature.

July 7—Patchogue, N. Y.; Round Table Club; my third visit to this mighty interesting group of gentlemen, and I shall be happy to accede to their request to come again. About fifty in attendance.

July 10—White Plains, N. Y.; Kiwanis Club, thirty present. This is my twelfth lecture on the Single Tax in White Plains. The most impatient could not find fault with the growth of Single Tax sentiment in this thriving and progressive city.

July 12—New York, N. Y.; second radio talk over Station WHAP.

July 14—Far Rockaway, N. Y.; Exchange Club; twenty-six present my fourth visit to this group. A splendid lot of fellows, inquiring, open minded, friendly and gradually absorbing the idea.

July 19—New York, N. Y.; third radio talk over Station WHAP.

This makes 154 lectures so far this year, and the number of auditors amount to 15,489. This, of course, does not include talks over the air as there is no way of telling how many listen in, but a good many must listen in, judging by the letters received. These letters are all kind and friendly toward the Single Tax, all of them without exception asking for literature.

JAMES R. BROWN.

Following are a few excerpts from the many letters to hand which comment on Mr. Brown's lectures:

July 9, 1931.

Just recently I started to read "The Philosophy of Henry George"

by Dr. Geiger, and what a pleasure that reading is! I can't tell you how much I appreciate your sending me the volume and thus giving me the opportunity of becoming acquainted with it. If such material can only be given wide enough circulation the results should be great. And to you must go my thanks for the several newspapers and bulletins which have come my way from various Single Taxers throughout the country. It has been pleasant to receive them, for I imagine you have given them my name.

You will be interested in the answers to one of my final examination questions last month. I asked the students to name what had been the most outstanding thing they had secured from their course in economics, and to my surprise and delight three of them specifically mentioned you and the lectures you had given here in Wesleyan. One of them added, "and I believe that I am a confirmed Single Taxer." Those people will be among those who will be looking forward to your return next year.

Indeed I do appreciate your making it possible for me to read and enjoy some of this material on the Single Tax. My interest and my devotion to the cause is assured.

WM. T. BEADLES,

Dept. of Economics, Illinois Wesleyan Univ., Bloomington, Ill.

JULY 2, 1931.

I recall a portion of your talk wherein you said that one does not begrudge the paying of a bill where there has been service rendered, and so it is with the greatest of pleasure that I enclose our club's check for services rendered. I assure you every one who heard you speak feels you have indeed rendered us a great service. Your talk has created a good deal of interest among the taxpayers here, and one hears the following regret expressed on every hand by those who did not attend: "I wish I had attended the lecture the other night; I have been kicking myself for not going." So I am in hopes that the next time it is our good fortune to have you with us you will have a larger audience.

I not only appreciate having heard you speak, but I feel richer for having met you personally, and I also send the club's most sincere and hearty thanks for being with us on Monday night last. May it be our privilege to hear you again in the near future.

GLENN B. WOODBURY,
Secretary Salem Lions' Club.

May, 22, 1931.

Enclosed is clipping from the May 21 issue of the *Home News* giving an outline of your talk at our luncheon meeting on Tuesday, May 19. May I take this opportunity of extending the thanks of our members for the very interesting address which you made on this occasion?

F. A. RITCHINGS,
Secretary Chamber of Commerce, Washington Heights.

March 23, 1931.

Thank you for your letter of the 14th. You started something here in South Bend, and it is up to you to help settle this controversy by rendering, at as early a date as possible, specific data and plan to cover the Single Tax question which you so ardently advocated. I wish you might hear some of the reactions to your address. The only criticism I have heard was that the remedy was apparently something mysterious, something which you did not have time to give the boys. They want you to come back and take your "light from under the bushel."

GEORGE J. GEISLER, M. D.

June 6, 1931.

I read your letter of May 12 to the members present at our June 4 meeting and they were unanimous in their expression of complete pleasure, of entertainment and enjoyment and food for serious thought which they derived from your visit. May I personally add my impression: that you are a past master of the art of oratory and expression, and that your missionary work throughout the country cannot help but eventually bear fruit.

H. E. ERICKSON,
Leonia Board of Trade.

May 28, 1931.

To Whom It May Concern: On April 15, 1931, Mr. James Roger Brown addressed the membership of our lodge on the subject "Single Tax." Mr. Brown's talk was very delightfully arranged and was most interesting as well as instructive. The facts as presented by Mr. Brown were worthy of consideration, and I highly recommend him to anyone interested in the subject of Single Tax.

ALBERT B. KRIES,
Secretary, Baltimore Lodge 7, B. P. O. Elks.

Glad to receive your letter, and in return would say the pleasure was more than half ours, for our men were highly pleased with your talk. And I think they were more than half convinced you are right, but the main difficulty seems to be the feasibility of the plan, how to get it adopted and applied with things as they are.

F. F. VOORHEES,
Pastor Summerfield M. E. Church, Port Chester, N. Y.

Our Premier Lecturer

IT would be folly to claim that Mr. James R. Brown is without his critics. If there is anything more than another that characterizes this movement it is differences of opinion. The followers of Henry George are strong individualists. It may even be said that many are too strongly enamored of their own methods of presenting the doctrine. In view of this it is even more remarkable to reflect that 99 per cent of all Single Taxers throughout the country have no words but those of praise for Mr. Brown's lecture work.

Yet as we say he has his critics. Before us lies a letter in which the writer speaks of Mr. Brown's "peculiar brand of Single Tax." This characterization comes from one who has not in recent years heard Mr. Brown and who has persistently declined all invitations to hear him. We confess to a little bewilderment at the mental processes of the writer. Do these striking testimonials to Mr. Brown from all over the country mean nothing? Is the army of converts among college professors and business men who confess their conversion under Mr. Brown's teachings, talking merely out of politeness, or for the sake of hearing themselves? Speaking generally, this criticism comes from those who do not know of the extraordinary success Mr. Brown is meeting with everywhere.

We quote another of his critics: "We want to preach the doctrines of Henry George in the words of Henry George." But must we really insist upon that? Surely the objection to this is that it leaves no room for individual interpretation. As a matter of fact the language of mankind differs with every generation. Each period must produce its own idiom and each individual his own style. And the doctrines of Henry George are translatable into every vernacular. It is the *substance*, not the *manner* that is important. And it not the *words*, but the *thought* that we shall recognize when some great popular leader of thought shall translate Henry George into the language of the day, or speak after his own manner. Is not this inevitable?

In our estimate of the value of Mr. Brown's work we

have nothing to take back. We have said repeatedly that we have never doubted the value of this work. We said at a dinner of the Manhattan Single Tax Club some time ago that "a great truth has many doors." And to the statement that our lecturer confines himself too much to the fiscal aspect of the Single Tax we reply that he by no means confines himself to that aspect of the question. And to those who want the ethical side emphasized it is sufficient to reply that our lecturer never neglects the ethical consideration in his insistence on the sacredness of private property and the community's title to what is public.

It is true he avoids saying that we must make land common property. The ordinary man does not understand this. He is very apt to translate it into his own phrases, "Confiscate, destroy, apply the torch." But in effect, are not the teachings of Henry George complete in the doctrine that land values are social values, and is not this the essence of Mr. Brown's preachments?

We say we have nothing to take back in this estimate of the tremendous value of Mr. Brown's lecture work. But we do feel that our conviction of the value of this work has been greatly strengthened by what the screen photographers call "close up" pictures of Mr. Brown in action. He has developed by his wide experience a knowledge of the psychology of audiences that is almost uncanny. From the start he is a friend of every man among his hearers. He has broken down their reserve. Often on the conclusion of his talks have we heard such expressions as "That is the best speech I have ever listened to," or "He has given us something to think about," and once, "It seems we have been suckers a long time."

Of course, he cannot teach in a half hour's address the whole of political economy. He is not such a fool as to attempt it. But in language almost if not quite eloquent—eloquence would not help him as a lecturer—he conveys the great lesson. And he seems to us by far the ablest lecturer the Single Tax movement has ever known.

As evidence that he does not neglect the broader aspects of our question let the following suffice:

"What a dreadful world this would be if we could not solve social problems, if it were beyond the power of man to discover the cause of hard times and apply the remedy, if through the countless ages yet to come we had to endure every now and again such a period of anguish and suffering. But that is inconsistent with the evident plan of nature, for there is an answer to every question, there is a solution for every problem, there is a right way and a wrong way to do any necessary thing. We have risen to dizzy heights in the production of wealth; as by magic we make the earth give forth her increase, and out of the storehouse of nature our hands, with skill exceeding that of the magician, draw forth everything that the human mind can conceive or heart desire."

"The problems that cause the race so much trouble

do not exist in the ordination of nature. They do not arise and worry us because of any failure in the natural order of things, but because we do not understand that natural order. In other words, a problem is a discordant note that destroys the harmony of life due to the fact that our human actions in some respect fail to harmonize with natural law.

"It is quite evident therefore, that the first thing to do is to seek out the natural order, the natural law affecting life in that particular respect. Then by making our human action conform to this natural law, we shall solve the problem and our difficulties will disappear."

"We rob the citizen of his private property when we tax labor products and we rob society of social property when we fail to take for social use all land values. We raise social revenue by taking from every man who can show tangible evidence that he has done something for himself, and at the same time we give millions every year of social value to those who cannot show that they have rendered any service whatever to themselves or to society.

"The only true measure of the value of social presence and service to a citizen is the value of which he has exclusive possession. Land value is the value that attaches to land, irrespective and independent of the improvements thereon, and it reflects, not personal effort and production, but social presence and social activities. A large city with modern utilities will have much land value. A small village with few and poor public utilities will have little land value and service to a citizen is the value of the land of which he has exclusive possession. Land value is the value that attaches to land, irrespective and independent of the improvements thereon, and it reflects, not personal effort and production, but social presence and social activities. A large city with modern utilities will have much land value. A small village with few and poor public utilities will have little land value."

"Labor value is the value of something produced. Land value is the value of the opportunity to produce. We pay the landowners for permission to use something they did not make, nor did they create the value attached thereto, and when they get land values for private use, they are gathering where society has sown.

"It ought to be clear to us now that what we call land value is not the value of land at all, but the value of population and government; and that this value that comes with the coming of society and grows with the growing of society is the natural source of public revenue. It is just as scientific to say this as to say that the milk that comes into the mother's breasts at the birth of the child is for the sustenance of the child. If we would collect this value, which we call economic rent, this annual land value, this value created by society—and there is always plenty for all social needs—we could abolish all taxes upon private property. We would have a tax system that never could be oppressive because it would be taking public value only for public use and we could refrain from taking one cent of private property for public use. This would mean 100 per cent encouragement to industry and no reward to idleness."

"Now, the trouble with *something for nothing* is, it has another side, seldom mentioned, it is true, and if mentioned at all only very briefly and in hushed tones. The other side is the fact that when I get *something for nothing*, someone else must get *nothing for something*. It cannot be otherwise. This is the fly in the ointment of our civilization.

"I may never meet the man who loses because I gain through some form of privilege; he may not be a member of my church or my golf club, may not even reside in the same city, but he is *somewhere*, perhaps on a windswept prairie farm, clinging with desperation to a false hope that some day things will turn his way. He may reside in city slums, carrying daily with him a dead heart, because hope had died; but *he is somewhere*. It is the law of God and nature that if the producers' hands are empty it is because through wicked and stupid laws, some of us are able to gather where others have sown."

After reading these significant extracts from Mr. Brown can any one doubt that he is bringing the message of Henry George to audiences who are more and more attracted to the doctrines and to the unique personality which makes him so effective a teacher. As a matter of fact no one who has listened to him really doubts it.

Henry George Foundation Announces Expansion Programme

PRESIDENT GEORGE E. EVANS of the Henry George Foundation announces a programme of expanded activities under the auspices of that organization and has issued a call to the Single Taxers of America to rally for united action against poverty and unemployment, stressing the fact that the present world-wide industrial depression constitutes a real challenge to Georgists, affording at the same time an unusual opportunity to advance the cause while the public is receptive to economic proposals.

Report is made of the consummation of plans for the consolidation of the Henry George Lecture Association with the Foundation. The Lecture Association has had an active life as an effective national organization for more than twenty-five years, having been founded in 1903 by the late Frederick H. Monroe, of Chicago, and since his death in 1929 has been under the management of his son, John Lawrence Monroe, who has completed a nation-wide tour since assuming responsibility for the work. Two national headquarters will be maintained, with John Lawrence Monroe serving as Associate Secretary of the Foundation and Director of its Lecture Department, the scope of which will be considerably enlarged.

The lecture staff as announced at this time consists of Hon. George H. Duncan, of New Hampshire, Attorney William N. McNair of Pittsburgh (recently Director of the Ingram Institute), Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown of the University of Missouri, Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow of Cincinnati, and Executive Secretary Percy R. Williams of Pittsburgh. During the past year, McNair, Williams and Brown have made extended tours through the West

and Middle West and parts of the East. A tour is now being arranged for McNair for the months of September and October through New England, New York and other eastern states. During the summer McNair has been conducting a series of very successful and well attended meetings in the Pittsburgh district and has also given a series of lectures on Economic Rent at Ashland College in Michigan.

A number of regional conferences are planned for the larger centers for the purpose of bringing Single Taxers together and encouraging activity and local organization. The first of these will probably be held this fall in Boston, New York and Philadelphia, either immediately preceding or following the Baltimore convention.

Distinguished Speakers to Address Baltimore Congress

HON. DAVID J. LEWIS, member of Congress from the Cumberland, Maryland, District and former Tariff Commissioner under the Wilson administration, will be one of the distinguished orators on the programme of the Henry George Congress meeting in Baltimore, October 12th—14th. Congressman Lewis is recognized as an expert on the tariff and has also for many years been identified with the Single Tax movement. He had served in Congress before his appointment on the Tariff Commission and at one time was the nominee of the Democratic Party for United States Senator. Last fall he was again chosen by a substantial majority to represent his district in the House of Representatives.

There is also a strong possibility that other members of the House and Senate will be on the programme at Baltimore as both Senator Clarence C. Dill of Washington and Congressman Robert Crosser of Cleveland have indicated their purpose to be present if possible.

Hon. Albert C. Ritchie, Maryland's distinguished Governor, who is prominently mentioned as a Presidential possibility, will extend his official greetings to the Henry George Congress. The Convention Committee is still in the early stages of programme-making but Chairman Charles G. Baldwin and his associates are soliciting other distinguished persons and among speakers of prominence who have already been definitely scheduled are: Hon. George H. Duncan, of the New Hampshire Legislature; Judson King, Secretary of the National Popular Government League; Benjamin C. Marsh, Secretary of the People's Lobby; Bolton Hall, Frank Stephens, Will Atkinson, Wm. N. McNair, Clayton J. Ewing, Jos. B. Chamberlain, Jas. F. Morton, Dr. Mark Millikin, Hon. Edward Polak, Mrs. Alice Thacher Post, Ernest B. Gaston, Hugh Reid, Robert C. Macauley, Harry W. Olney and Fiske Warren. The officers of the Foundation including George E. Evans, President; Joseph Dana Miller, Vice President; Mrs. Anna George

de Mille, Honorary Vice President; Percy R. Williams, Executive Secretary; John Lawrence Monroe, Associate Secretary; and Francis W. Maguire, Assistant Secretary; are all expected to be active participants in the convention proceedings and one or more sessions will be devoted to important official business having to do with policies, plans and activities of the Henry George Foundation.

The members of the Baltimore Convention Committee include the following: Charles G. Baldwin, Chairman; John Salmon, Vice Chairman; Will Atkinson, H. J. Bailey, L. D. Beckwith, Andrew P. Canning, Alfred N. Chandler, Samuel Danziger, Charles R. Eckert, James B. Ellery, Clayton J. Ewing, Henry S. Ford, Allan Farquhar, Robert J. Boyd, J. C. Fuller, Ernest B. Gaston, Charles H. Ingersoll, Erwin Kauffman, Mrs. Rosa Kiefer, G. Frank Kelly, Fenton Lawson, J. C. Lincoln, Morton G. Loyd, Joseph Dana Miller, John B. McGauran, Dr. Mark Millikin, Charles F. Nesbit, Hon. Wm. J. Ogden, Harry W. Olney, Charles J. Ogle, Chester C. Platt, Miss Charlotte O. Schetter, Mrs. Roswell Skeel, Jr., Wm. H. Sikes, Frank T. Stirlith, Walter G. Stewart, George M. Strachan, Harold Sudell, Mrs. Lucy Swanton, Henry B. Tawresey, and August Williges.

The officers and members of the Maryland Tax Reform Association, a body which has been active for many years in behalf of land value taxation and has some achievements to its credit, are working hard for the success of the convention and are preparing to entertain good-sized delegations from the various sections, particularly the larger eastern cities within easy access of Baltimore. They will appreciate hearing early from all who plan to attend in order that hotel reservations and other details may be arranged. Communications should be addressed to the Foundation headquarters, Berger Building, Pittsburgh.

Tax Progress in Pittsburgh

A FURTHER step for Pittsburgh in the right direction has been secured through the enactment of a law at the present session of the Pennsylvania Legislature abolishing the county tax upon occupations and substituting therefor a nominal and uniform poll tax of only 50 cents. Through this measure sponsored by State Senator James J. Coyne, there has been stricken from the tax rolls of Allegheny County an assessed valuation of \$140,000,000. It is estimated that the actual "loss" in revenue is about \$400,000 per annum, representing more than one-fourth of a mill in the tax levy.

This action forecasts the complete elimination of the poll tax which has long been required by the constitution of Pennsylvania. The nominal tax of 50 cents is retained pending the amendment of the constitution because that instrument now permits only direct tax-

payers to vote. However, the Legislature has at the same time passed a resolution submitting a constitutional amendment to the voters providing for the elimination of the provision which makes the possession of a tax receipt a requisite for the exercise of the franchise. But since this question cannot be submitted before 1933, the Coyne bill was passed to afford an immediate remedy.

PITTSBURGH CONSIDERING PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

During recent months there has developed a strong movement on behalf of a new city charter for Pittsburgh which would bring that city to an advanced position in its political administration as well as with respect to achievements in tax reform. The proposed changes in the charter would embody the election of the City Council by proportional representation and give the Council authority to choose a City Manager. A bill giving cities of the second and third classes the right to adopt such a plan of government was unanimously endorsed by the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh, the Taxpayers' League and several of the most prominent organizations in the city.

While, of course, unpopular with the political machine, the movement is making rapid headway and is being more vigorously advocated by all three of the daily newspapers. Fortunately, proportional representation is now recognized as the most important feature of the proposed municipal plan and if finally adopted, is likely to lead to the election of one or more active Single Taxers to the City Council of nine, as has happened in other cities employing this method so favorable to fair minority representation.

"The Philosophy of Henry George"

COPIES of the remarkable thesis of George Raymond Geiger, son of our treasurer Oscar H. Geiger, were mailed to a number of those to whom it was thought the book would appeal.

It will be of interest to our readers to note the character of the reception given to the book, and a few of the letters of commendation follow:

Mrs. Alice Thacher Post: "I can readily see that the author has made a very exhaustive study of the subject and a man is fortunate who takes for his thesis a subject which is so rewarding."

Hon. Edward Polak: "I hope to receive much benefit and enjoyment from the work. To you must be given credit for having raised a fine son who is such a devoted and intelligent exponent of our philosophy."

James F. Morton: "Even a cursory examination shows that George's thesis is an extraordinarily able and thorough presentation. And to put it over at Columbia of all universities! I am mighty glad to have it on hand for permanent

reference, and anticipate much pleasure and profit from a closer perusal of it."

Hon. Jackson H. Ralston: "He has added something of real and great value to Single Tax discussion."

W. M. Southam, editor of the *Ottawa Citizen*, Ottawa, Ontario: "In so far as I have read it I find it extremely interesting."

Rev. John Haynes Holmes: "Please accept my heartiest thanks for this most interesting work by Dr. Geiger on 'The Philosophy of Henry George.' I have a Henry George shelf in my library and am proud and happy to add this volume to my collection."

Hon. Lawson Purdy: "I have already glanced through it and have been much impressed. I am sure that it is a very valuable contribution. I hope it may impress the college world as it should."

Hon. Charles O'Connor Hennessy: "I think I had the pleasure of reading part of this book in manuscript form and at that time was inspired with a very high respect for the intellectual integrity and unusual industry which have brought together so great an array of annotated material bearing upon the work of Henry George."

John Lawrence Monroe: "Your review of George Geiger's 'The Philosophy of Henry George' eloquently expresses the feeling I had as I glanced through the book and then started to read it. 'This is not a work to be skimmed through. . . . The word 'scholarly' only half defines it. . . . In this work he has given evidence of his nearly universal knowledge on the subject. . . . He has stamped with the imprint of his own genius a remarkable exposition of the economics and philosophy of Henry George.'"

E. G. Swan, Librarian, College of William and Mary: "I can see by glancing through it that it is a very thoughtful study of George and that the thesis as a whole is very far above the type usually turned out by doctors of philosophy."

Prof. A. G. Taylor, College of William and Mary: "I wish to thank you for the copy of 'The Philosophy of Henry George' which you so kindly sent me. One of my summer school students here is now preparing a review of it to present before a class of 31 mature school teachers, principals and superintendents."

Prof. Tipton R. Snively, Professor of Economics, University of Virginia: "The thesis by George Raymond Geiger on 'The Philosophy of Henry George,' came in the mail this morning. I have already browsed through it; in fact have spent a good part of the morning enjoying it. It is scholarly, sympathetic and accurate. It deserves to have a wide hearing and I wish that it could be made available to university students in government and economics everywhere. The influence of Henry George goes marching on with increasing force, and deservedly so. He was a great man."

Other acknowledgments of the receipt of the book, one of very cordial content from Justice Brandeis, were

received from Justice Holmes, George L. Rusby, E. B. Swinney, Jacob Lange, and others.

George Geiger is now in Europe. As we write, a card comes to us from Rev. Father Thomas Dawson, of Dublin which reads: "I am much obliged to you for the pleasure of seeing here today Dr. George Raymond Geiger."

The Advertiser's Perplexity

EDWIN S. COLES, who conducts the *Mansfield, Pa. Advertiser*, is said by Robert Urell, to be the best editor in the county. At least he is a very honest and candid one, for he says of his friend Urell, veteran Single Taxer:

"At various times he has given us literature on the Single Tax and we have tried hard to find out what it was all about, but owing to the fact that the convolutions of our cerebrum do not always convolute on all four cylinders, we do not know much more about it than we did at the beginning."

We make this explanation so that if we accuse Single Taxers of anything of which they are not guilty, it is because we don't know what we are talking about."

And then in the following line he explains the source of his perplexity by describing just what the Single Tax is *not* in the following words:

"As we understand the Single Tax, it would be on land alone, regardless of the value of the land, a sort of foot front assessment similar to that used in assessing property owners for a share of building-improved streets."

The statements that follow are all based on the misunderstanding that the Single Tax is a tax on land rather than on *land values*. Mansfield must be like other towns where the value of lots have gone up by reason of the enterprise of its citizens, and where the owners have done nothing to increase this value. If Mr. Coles will stop to reflect that a small tax on the selling value of land (which is an untaxed value since the selling price is what remains after the tax is taken) would pay every cost of the public improvements which Mansfield enjoys, and that such a system would do away with the need of fining people for their improvements, he may get an inkling of just what we are after.

Owners would be taxed only in proportion to the values produced by these public services. The value of land is a public value. It should pay the cost of government, for the value is due directly to what government does for Mansfield, in the way of schools, sewerage, lighting, fire department, public libraries, etc. Take these away and land values would disappear. Is it fair to the improving owners that they should be taxed to increase the return to the owners of land who profit by everything the city does?

And surely Mr. Coles will know of men in the city of Mansfield, who sit tight, refusing to improve their land while the town grows up around them. And following his thought further, can he not see the effect upon the

business of the city, home owners, store keepers, etc., who must be heavily taxed to pay the needed revenues?

We are sure that Mr. Coles will get his thinking cap on straight when his brain begins to work on "all four cylinders."

Recent Signs of Progress

A NUMBER of comments, editorial and otherwise, concerning the Single Tax and President Butler's recent very definite allusions to Henry George, have appeared. Among those which should be noted are articles in the *Brooklyn Eagle* and *Johnstown Democrat*. The *Boston Globe* published a three column article on "Great Estates in England" and stresses the influence of Henry George on British opinion. The *Labor Magazine* of London has a splendid article entitled "A New Doomsday Book," and reviews the forerunners of Henry George and the evolution of the land question. A stupid article of two columns appears in the *Boston Transcript* of June 28 by Mark Mason, upon which it would be needless to comment. Dr. Marion Mills Miller appears with an article in *Letters*, a quarterly magazine published by the University of Kentucky, Lexington. Its title is "Henry George, Philosopher of the Natural Order." Nine pages are occupied by this contribution, which is a thoughtful and well considered study of Henry George, and like all that Doctor Miller writes is worth while. *Farm and Dairy*, of Peterboro, Ontario, has an editorial in which it declares: "The taxation of land values, especially in urban centers, would be the most important step that could be taken." This is one of the influential farm journals of Canada.

Unemployment

SOLON made a democratic constitution for Athens, giving the franchise for voting to all the four grades of society, but limiting office holding to the higher grades. He forgave debts where the person and liberty of the debtor were responsible. He did very little toward restoring the land to the people, merely restoring hill lands back to the hill dwellers. He established manufacture, trade and many crafts. He was desirous of more and greater reforms, but alas! the conservatives were too strong.

In Rome the Gracii, two of the noblest Romans and world emancipators struggled to colonize the poor on idle public lands, but the landlords overcame and killed them. In China Confucius and Mencius tried to restore the ancient land system which used land rents for taxes, but the monopolists prevented. Joseph in Egypt took advantage of the great famine and secured government ownership of the land. He rented the land to the people for one-fifth of the crop (20 per cent). Rawlinson says that the landlords of Egypt were very oppressive. Chinese landlords charge often one-half the crop as rent (50 per cent). To enable the people to pay 20 per cent instead of 50 per cent was a great reform. Joseph was one of the

great emancipators of the world. The rental would be used for taxes and still further help the farmers.

In this time of unemployment it is well to study Nehemiah, Chapter 5. The people were so oppressed that they were obliged to sell their children as slaves, giving as a reason: "Other men have our lands and our vineyards." Nehemiah ordered them to disgorge. "Restore ye now this day their lands and their vineyards." They responded: "We will restore them and require nothing of them"—that is, NO COMPENSATION. This was a real reformation far superior to that of Solon.

In the last analysis all employment is on land.

Our 5,000,000 of unemployed can blame the landlord. Other men have our lands and our opportunities. They corner the business sites, manufacturing sites, mines, forests, water power sites; they monopolize gas, electric and other franchises. Our environment is owned by other men who levy tribute on us. Oh, for a Joseph or a Nehemiah to save us. Many daughters of the landless are sold into the vilest slavery to gratify the brutal desires of the meanest of men. Unemployed men have more troubles than slaves. Slaves are fed and cared for, as they are valuable property. An unemployed wage slave has no right to land and opportunity as have the "birds of the air" and the lilies of the field in the "kingdom of God."

Land values or land rent are made by all of the community, and really should belong to all. A tax of 5 per cent or 6 per cent should be levied on all land. Take part of this community value to care for the unemployed till they can get work. This is better than the English dole. It is not CHARITY but restoring to the worker a part of his wages kept back from him. Workmen naturally hate the word charity. It smells of superiority and benevolence. No one can be really benevolent but God.

Such a tax on land values would make it impossible to hold land idle or for speculation. It would produce a condition like the opening of a new country, as, for instance, the opening of Oklahoma. All who could not get a box to employ them could get a few acres and employ themselves. Manufacture, trade and industry would flourish with burdensome taxes removed and placed on unearned wealth—that is, on the "unearned increment" of land value.

The land value of New York is about ten billions. This with a 5 per cent. tax would produce one-half billion dollars—plenty for all taxes and for all the benefits that the socialists desire. Los Angeles has possibly \$200,000,000 of ground rent. Why should there be any need of charity? It is the money of the public and can be used for public purposes.—W. E. MACKIN.

Just Flew Away We Suppose

HENRY GEORGE'S Single Tax idea was much more practicable fifty years ago than it is today. Since then, much wealth has escaped from the land.

Los Angeles Times.

Problem of the Unjust Distribution of Wealth

THE problem of the production of wealth may be regarded as solved. Today our country, and every other civilized country on the globe, produces, or with the knowledge and powers at its command could produce, wealth more than sufficient to satisfy the rational desires of all its people. It is the problem of distribution alone that still awaits solution. The dire social ills which to many may seem the inevitable accompaniment of our advance in material progress—insufficient earnings, unwilling unemployment of millions of men.

The undeserved helpless poverty, and its attendant train of misery, disease, vice and crime, are all directly traceable to the prevailing unjust distribution of wealth. Therefore, the social problem of the twentieth century may be briefly summarized as follows: How can the equitable distribution of the natural wealth be secured for all those who with brain or muscle directly or indirectly contribute toward its production?

All wealth has to be produced by labor from land. This term, bear in mind, includes all natural forces and opportunities inherent in land. Hence we may safely conclude that the social customs that regulate and determine the relations of the masses of mankind to the land of the country they inhabit must necessarily remain the main factor which determines their social, political, industrial and economic conditions.

This article is written to bring home to the reader the fundamental importance of the land question as offering the master key to the solution of the problem. For no real solution of the social problem is possible without the solution of the land question. Every effect has a cause, and every fact implies a preceding fact. Let us attempt to solve by the methods of political economy the great problem we have outlined.

The three things, say political economists, are required to produce wealth: Land, Labor and Capital. Land refers to Nature, the whole material universe outside of man himself. Labor refers to all human exertion, and Capital to the tools of production, or that part of wealth used in the production of more wealth.

Three things also divide the wealth produced: Rent, Wages and Interest. Rent is that part of the wealth produced which goes to the land owner for the use of land, Wages, that part of wealth produced which goes to labor for services performed, and Interest, that part of the wealth produced which goes to the capitalist for the service of capital.

Now, the tendency of material progress (and by material progress is meant the increase in population, improvements in the arts of production and exchange, inventions, etc.) is always to increase the tribute of the land owners; never to advance proportionately either wages or interest

(read that last sentence again, and I mean, of course, true wages and interest), but always to advance ground rent, to raise the value of land and nothing else.

As Dr. Adam Smith, "the father of political economy," wrote in his great book, "The Wealth of Nations" (Book 1, Chapter 11), published in 1776: "Every improvement in the circumstances of society tends either directly or indirectly to raise the real rent of the land, to increase the real wealth of the landlord, his power of purchasing the labor or the produce of the labor of the people."

Or as John Stuart Mill in "Principles of Political Economy" (Book 5, Chapter 11, Sec. 5) has put it: "The ordinary progress of society which increases in wealth is at all times tending to augment the incomes of the landlords; to give them a greater amount of the wealth of the community, independent of any trouble or outlay incurred by themselves. They grow richer, as it were, in their sleep without working, risking or economizing."

The value of the bare land in the United States has risen from 0 in 1607 to \$170,000,000,000 in 1930. Upon this vast sum the land-owning classes are collecting a ground rent estimated at \$13,600,000,000 annually—which means, as we have seen, that since produce equals rent plus wages plus interest, labor and capital must be satisfied with what is left after ground rent is taken out.

Let me quote Henry George in "Social Problems": "As it comes more and more difficult to obtain land, so will the virtual enslavement of the working classes go on. As the value of the land rises, more and more of the earnings of labor will be demanded for the use of land—that is to say, laborers must give up a greater and greater portion of their time to the services of the landlord until finally no matter how hard they work, nothing is left them but a bare living."

These conditions cannot be allowed to continue. Much less can they be allowed to grow worse. Yet this is the very tendency that is now going on. We are inventing 50,000 new labor saving devices every year, multiplying the power of labor and capital. We are effecting improvement after improvement in the arts of production and exchange, yet these are only enabling the owners of the earth to levy more tribute, only enabling them to further push up ground rent.

Rent is the price of the monopoly of natural resources, which human exertion can neither produce nor increase; and since land is the source of all wealth, may we not with certainty infer that the cause of the unjust distribution of wealth is that labor and capital are denied free access to land—the earth. Land is the very foundation of the social structure, and so long as we allow the land owners to absorb the ever rising land values, all the advantages of greater improvements, new inventions and discoveries, superior modes of production and exchange must necessarily go to the few instead of to all the people.

The earth itself is the gift of Nature to all continuing generations of mankind, and the increased value of its use

arises solely from the demand for it arising from the mere presence of population. There is only one solution: we must forever destroy land monopoly. We can do it by the simple method of taxing land values only. By taking the ground rent that now goes into private pockets for public purposes we can abolish all other taxes in whatever form.

This would destroy the privilege of land owners to reap where they have not sown, and would make all the unused land practically free to whomsoever wished to use it. Does it require severe intellectual effort to see the result? Labor and capital would then receive all that they are entitled to receive—the full product.

No longer would the non-producers gain at the expense of the producers. But the producers would gain at the expense of the non-producers, receiving the full benefits of advancing civilization. The problem of the unjust distribution of the wealth produced would then be solved, in the only way it can be solved, by recognizing the equal right of all men to the free use of Nature's bounty—the earth.

W. A. CRONENBERGER, in *Ohio State Journal*.

Looting the Public Domain

SELFISH, unscrupulous private interests, aided by corrupt public officials, have robbed this country of its choicest public domains, with the result that comparatively poor resources which "the looters" overlooked are all that remain in the public possession, the fourth volume of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, published by the MacMillan Company, declares in an article on conservation.

The article is written by F. G. Tryon, an expert attached to several United States bureaus and a member of the editorial staff of the encyclopedia. Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman of Columbia University is editor-in-chief of the encyclopedia's staff.

The administration of Secretary of the Interior Albert B. Fall is condemned particularly in the criticism of the "looting" of the public domains. The article declares that "the administration of the naval oil reserves under Secretary Fall reached the lowest depths of corruption."

The article declares the searchlight of publicity on public corruption after the scandals of the Harding administration aroused the public to the importance of conserving what remained of the once widespread public resources. By the passage of new land laws the conservation movement accomplished one of its primary aims, "the protection of the remaining public domain against looting by private interests," the article asserts.

"The resources to which the nation thus retained title were, however, largely marginal, represent, except for water power, only what private interests had overlooked or passed by as of small value."

New York Times, June 23, 1931.

Private Property

THE Bible says: "the land is mine saith the Lord, and shall not be sold." And again: "the heavens even the heavens are the Lords, but the earth He has given to the children of men." Yet about 95 per cent of the human race is disinherited, and have no right to one square inch of God's bounty, which He created equally for all His children. Please explain.

CHICAGO, ILL.

W. B. S.

Your first text refers to the divine prohibition against selling land beyond the year of jubilee, at which time the land was to be returned to its former owner. See Leviticus chapter 25:23.

The second text shows that God is the absolute owner of all things, since He created them. But by explicit revelation He has given the land to the children of men for their temporal sustenance. God remains absolute owner of all creation, whereas man enjoys only the dominion of use in subjection to God's sovereign right. Man shares in a certain degree in the dominion of God because he has been made according to God's image and likeness. On account of this likeness God said of man: "let him have dominion . . . over the whole earth." (Gen. 1:26.)

This divine grant is not to be understood to mean that a certain portion of this earth has been assigned by God to every individual directly, but in the sense that every man because he is a rational being, *has the inherent right to possess land*, and other external things, as his own.

It is no discovery to find that a strong minority of the human race controls a major portion of the earth. This *unequal distribution* of the land is one of the greatest causes of civil unrest. It gives a handle to the socialist school to advocate the abandonment of the principle of private ownership. The unlimited ownership of land by a few is an abuse of a divine grant no one of common sense will dare to deny. But the gross abuse of the principle of private ownership does not forbid its use, or demonstrate its falsity.

Something, however, must be done towards enabling more people to become land owners, for economic stability will hardly be attained unless the major part of the human race has a small share of what God has granted to all.

The Sign, June, 1931, published by the Passionist Fathers.

THE debt recess, if accepted by all nations involved will not admit our products to Canadian markets from which they have been excluded by the retaliatory legislation of the Dominion.

CLAUDE BOWERS in *New York Journal*.

THE great labor problem during the civil war time was to obtain the requisite number of workers for the fast expanding industries of the land, the more so because industry had to compete with the appeal of great areas of free land in the West. Labor began to organize. During the stern years of the 1870's there was a series of war strikes.—*Boston Herald*.

A Trade Union Organ On Henry George

FROM a review of Henry George's books we extract the following paragraphs. The review is by W. C. Glazebrook and appears in the *Record* of London, Eng., devoted to Transport and General Workers:

"The publication, in a cheap and handy form, of these books is a distinct aid to us of this generation to re-learn the truths that Henry George established.

"Reading these books, and reviewing them collectively—as the sequent items in the expression of a man's philosophy—I am convinced of several facts about the man and his work. There is, first of all, his passionate humanity:

"In cities where there exists a pauper class and a criminal class, where young girls shiver as they sew for bread, and tattered children make a home in the streets, money is regularly raised to send missionaries to the heathen! It would be laughable if it were not so sad. Baal no longer stretches forth his hideous sloping arms; but in Christian lands mothers slay their infants for a burial fee! And I challenge the production from any authentic accounts of savage life of such descriptions of savage life as are to be found in official documents of highly civilized countries, in reports of sanitary commissioners, and of inquiries into the condition of the laboring poor."

Then there is the literary quality of his writings. The purpose of prose, we are told, is to get itself immediately and continuously understood. The prose of Henry George fulfils this purpose. For example:

"Near the window by which I write a great bull is tethered by the nose. Grazing round and round, he has wound his rope about the stake until now he stands a close prisoner, tantalized by rich grass he cannot reach, unable even to toss his head to rid him of the flies that cluster on his shoulders. Now and again he struggles vainly, and then, after pitiful bellowings, relapses into silent misery. This bull, a very type of massive strength, who, because he has not wit enough to see how he might be free, suffers want to the sight of plenty, and is helplessly preyed upon by weaker creatures, seems to me no unfit emblem of the working masses. In all lands, men whose toil creates abounding wealth are pinched with poverty, and, while advancing civilization opens wider vistas and awakens new desires, are held down to brutish levels by animal needs."

"This passage contains practically all the virtues of prose composition. That, however, is for the academicians; what interests us is that he enforces and illustrates his lesson in a thoroughgoing way with nothing slipshod about it. I feel sure that this partly explains his hold over that generation of exacting scholars to whom I have referred. If those of the 'nineties demanded austere English usage, they had also some pretty notions as to the functions of the speculative thinker. Henry George's philosophy is clear and logical. In any seemingly cast-iron analogy

he can see, unerringly, the weak spot. His blows in destructive criticism are as devastating as a steam-hammer and as certain as a sculptor's; his arguments in building up a case are as purposeful as the moves of a chess-player and as patient as the solver of a jig-saw puzzle. I should like to have listened to Henry George debating."

Interesting Developments In Argentina

AN interesting conflict has arisen between the National Executive and the Governor of the province of Santiago del Estero. The Governor issued a decree offering for sale 375,000 acres of public land to meet obligations of the provincial debt.

This action was immediately disauthorized by the National Executive, in a telegram that reads as follows:

"The sale of the land in lots, which your decree proposes, far from attaining its object, promotes the monopoly of large areas, with all the known evils which that involves.

"The big estate, besides being the worst obstacle to progress, is the source of profound social evils, the grave consequences of which directly affect our national life. On the other hand, the reserve prices fixed for sale are so low that they constitute a veritable liquidation sale of the public land. Your Excellency well knows that this property is the sacred patrimony of the Nation, and that, only by means of a premeditated and careful plan of colonization could it be used to the best advantage of the public, and yet without the State having to part with one single square inch of its own exclusive property."

The Minister of the Interior then proceeds: "In order to meet the service of the debt, your Excellency's government should easily be able to select another source of revenue, without having to resort to the alienation of public land, the patrimony of which the national executive defends zealously on behalf of the supreme interest of the Nation, since wealth of the land, like that of the mineral subsoil of the Republic, cannot and must not be the subject of exploitations other than those of the Nation itself."

The conclusion of this singularly interesting declaration of the national executive runs as follows:

"Nothing, therefore, obliges us to precipitation in our plans for the public welfare. On the contrary, everything demands a constant vigilance on our part in order that the people's rights, which cost so much to gain, shall be maintained intact until, in the course of the government's progressive efforts, the moment shall arrive for settling them, on an effective organic plan that will make it possible to extend to all parts of the country the greatest well-being and happiness."

—*Tribuna Georgista*, organ of the Argentine Georgist Confederation.

A New Source of Revenue?

DUNGANNON URBAN COUNCIL has extracted a toll of 3s. from an anti-vivisection lecturer who was visiting their district. The speaker complained in no other part of Ireland had he been asked to pay such a tax.

This strikes us as a novelty in State theft, but while quite opposed to it, we are not insensible to the semblance of poetic justice it bears: too often it was the lecturer who taxed his audience!—*Commonweal*, London, Eng.

Fighting A Grievous Wrong

HOWEVER dissatisfied one may be with the inadequacy of Snowden's proposed land tax, the chancellor of the exchequer deserves the highest compliments for refusal to pussyfoot on the fundamental principle involved. He states unequivocally:

"If private individuals continue to possess nominal claim to the land they must pay rent to the community. The land was given by the Creator not for use of dukes but for the equal use of all his children. Restriction on the use of land is a restriction on human liberty and freedom."

This states the issue clearly. Private ownership of land is the grievous wrong which Snowden is fighting.

—Johnstown, (Pa.) *Democrat*.

PRESIDENT HOOVER calls the existing economic system "rugged individualism." Perhaps he meant to say that it was rugged on individualism. A system consisting of denials to individuals of the right to use of the earth, protective tariffs, anti-immigration laws, thousands of other laws to prohibit this and regulate that, special favors to a few, of "thou-shalt-nots and musts and favors to trusts," such a system is certainly not "rugged individualism," but might be drugged individualism. Perhaps Hoover was the victim of a typographical error.

LET a bunch of hungry donkeys be placed in a barren field with only a flimsy fence to separate them from a field covered with rich, growing grass. At the same time let the American people be placed in a country where they are denied, through legal claptrap, permission to earn their living, although the country is full of excellent but unused opportunities. Which group would reason out and solve their problem first, the donkeys or the American people?

LAST Sunday we quoted Dr. Ralph Dewey, professor of economics at Ohio State University, who shows that not one of the 16 cities in the United States of over 100,000 population that has operated municipal power plants since 1922 has chosen to change over and surrender the public good to private gain. In Cleveland, where power is municipally owned, he reports a noted increasing satisfaction in their operation.—Oklahoma, *Weekly Leader*.

Farm Values Decline

A DECLINE in farm real estate values in nearly all states during the year ended March 1, 1931, carried average values to a low point since the postwar agricultural depression began, according to an announcement of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. The index of values for the country as a whole on March 1, 1931, is placed at 106 per cent of the average of the prewar years 1912-14. The index for the year 1920 was 170 per cent of prewar, and in 1921 it was 127 per cent.

The bureau says that the combination of low prices brought world depression, and an already congested farm real estate market, was followed or accompanied by a widespread tendency toward a substantial writing down of the value of farm lands. The index of wholesale prices of all commodities dropped from 133 in March, 1930, to 106 in March, 1931, while the index of values of farm property dropped more slowly during the same period from 115 to 106.—*Bulletin of Information Service*, Federal Council of Churches.

To All Subscribers

A number of our subscribers in renewing their subscriptions have failed to indicate their acceptance of our premium offer of a copy of the Anniversary Edition of "Progress and Poverty." We desire to say that all are welcome if they wish it. Premium offers are usually reserved for new subscribers. We think this is unfair to those who have sent in their subscriptions from year to year, and are true and tried friends of the periodical making such offer.

If our subscribers wish to do us a favor let them go out and get some new subscribers, for we need them in these trying times. And a copy of "Progress and Poverty" goes with every subscription.

Now get busy!

WE have no panacea.

But we DO know some steps toward a cure for world's industrial ills:

Tolerance of each other's ideas; frank and free discussion of grievances and remedies.

The abolition of special privileges enjoyed by some of us at the expense of others.

The re-capturing by society as a whole (all of us) of the great natural resources grabbed by a few.

—Los Angeles *Record*

Thanksgiving Prayer for Pres. Hoover

FORGIVE us our debts, as we forgive our debtors from whom we can't collect.—BOLTON HALL.

BOOK REVIEW

ECONOMIC SCIENCE AND THE COMMON WELFARE*

Professor Brown has made for himself a unique position in the field of economics. He is that *rara avis*, a college professor who is not afraid to think aloud and express his thoughts even if those thoughts happen to run counter to the views of other teachers of political economy.

Most people, he writes, approach the subject with bias and inherited opinions, lacking in scientific validity.

"That the most glaring economic fallacies are supported by leading public men, probably, in large part, because, whatever their abilities at speech-making or in vote-getting, they understand economic principles no better than they understand physiological chemistry or the infinitesimal theory of the origin of our solar system, is a fact familiar to all economists." (Page 6.)

If the American voter could read and digest this book, he would quickly separate from the United States Senate such pseudo-economists as Senators Smoot, Watson and Borah, who prate about protecting American labor with a tariff, to say nothing of President Hoover and the so-called economists who surround him.

"The student of economics who would serve well his country and the world, needs most of all, perhaps, an enthusiasm for science. He must seek above all things to avoid prejudice in his thinking, to think clearly, to acquire information of scientific value and to use it logically. But, next to his enthusiasm for science, he should have a concern for the common welfare, so that, when he sees relationships of cause and effect in the economic realm an understanding of which will help to solve the problems of economic society and to further this welfare, he will endeavor in such ways as he can to make these relationships known. Scientific thinking must come first, else, even with the greatest good will in the world, we shall have only 'blind leaders of the blind.' But concern for the common welfare may properly be a motive to effort only second to the enthusiasm for science." (Page 8.)

This is the fifth edition of a work first published in 1923. It is truly a thought-provoking book. This reviewer, who has been studying the subject for over 25 years, found much to ponder over.

The book is in marked contrast to a volume (which shall remain nameless here) purporting to solve the problem of hard times, written by another college professor, which I reviewed a short time ago. That book was marked by artificiality, insincerity and downright dishonesty; this book breathes earnestness, conviction and a determination to spread the truth.

Lest I be accused of awarding too much approval, I want first to make six criticisms, five minor, one more substantial.

In a chapter wherein he discusses the forces behind supply and demand, Professor Brown, referring to those who refuse to act in accord with the ethical standards of community life, writes:

"And so, when all other motives and arguments fail, appeal must be made to such deterrents as jail and the hangman's rope." (Page 263.)

Is not the professor here a bit intemperate?

Is not our problem an objective one, namely to establish a rational economic order, rather than a personal one, and the scourging of individuals?

Professor Brown, at page 45, negatives the words I have just quoted. Here he writes:

"The untrained mind is prone to explain occurrences in terms of the activities of individuals rather than in terms of more or less impersonal forces."

I think Professor Brown might have been a bit more emphatic in his statement (page 19) of the futility of government price regulation.

*By Harry Gunnison Brown. Fifth edition; published by Lucas Brothers, Columbia, Mo.

The experiences of the rubber, coffee and wheat growers in Great Britain, Brazil and the United States, respectively, conclusively show that government price regulation is not *difficult*, as Professor Brown believes, but *impossible*. Likewise, the professor's statement on the same page, that it is extremely doubtful if governments could effectively regulate production and consumption, appears too mild in view of the experiences of these same governments. The sugar growers of the world will be next to learn that not even price regulation over the entire globe can be effective or successful.

The disastrous experiences of the Brazilian coffee growers, British rubber growers and American wheat growers have taught them nothing.

A more serious criticism I would direct at the chapter on Wages and Population. Here Professor Brown takes his position with those who advocate birth restriction as a means of eliminating poverty. Now, one can have no quarrel with those who believe in birth control, per se. Nature, someone has said, is deaf, dumb, blind and neutral, and unquestionably some degree of control must be practiced in all fields of life. An oyster produces millions of eggs of which only a handful grow to maturity. Fish spawn millions, of which only a few dozen survive to become big fish. Man, believe it or not, is capable of being the father of hundreds of children, and woman is capable of bearing children continuously from her fifteenth or sixteenth year to her climacteric. Our acceptance of monogamy requires that we practice some degree of control over our reproductive capacities. It seems to me, however, that there is a vital difference between a philosophy of birth regulation, which has for its central core a limitation of new life, to accord with the profligacy of nature, and a philosophy of birth control which seeks thus to eliminate poverty.

Professor Brown writes:

"Continuous increase of population, since natural resources are limited, tends towards diminished per capita production." (Page 369.)

There are, it seems to me, at least two errors in this statement. Only in a strictly philosophical sense may it be said that natural resources are limited. It is doubtful if the human mind is capable of conceiving our potential resources, *given a Free Earth and opportunity to exploit the Earth's resources*. Likewise, increased population tends toward increased, not diminished, per capita production. I am more efficient as I produce in cooperation with my fellow-man. Increased population permits greater specialization, which means greater efficiency.

A hundred million people in the United States live better than ten million formerly lived. Of course, at a certain point, the law of diminishing returns comes into play, that is, there finally comes a point where the United States, and in fact any country, could not stand the increase of another individual. I repeat: No human mind has sufficient imagination to say what that limit is.

Most hazards of population increase (based on past experience), have been far from the mark. President Lincoln, for example, in his first inaugural address in 1861, wrote:

"There are already among us those who, if the Union be preserved, will live to see it contain 250,000,000."

Seventy years later we have not yet reached one half that number.

Estimates of the earth's capacity (failing, as they must, to consider such undeterminable factors as invention and discovery) are even bigger guesses. This we may safely say: that the United States with 40 inhabitants to the square mile, if rationally organized from the economic view-point, may be considered woefully underpopulated. France supports 200 people to the square mile, Germany 350, Argentine 9, Australia 2, Canada 2.6.

True, many of the present inhabitants of the United States, as well as the countries which I have just named, do not receive adequate food, clothing and shelter, but does any thinking person claim that this is because of the niggardliness of the Creator?

Listen to the answers of the American and European farmers, who don't know what to do with all the grains and vegetables they have produced; the Argentinian cattle and sheep raisers, who are unable

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

in mountain regions and planted for grass in prairie regions. Such a project is hopeless under private ownership of land.

Some method of control of production of grain, oil and other products seems desirable for the sake of stability in social relations. Would not such control be vastly easier under public ownership of land?

Rent from land being a pure gift, would not the revenue from leasing government-owned land provide a perfect method of determining ability to pay taxes?

Or if one thought taxes should be levied according to benefits received, who receives as much benefit from government as one who receives a gift in the form of rent from land?

There are many other points in favor of this proposal, but these would seem to be enough to start discussion.

Santa Cruz, Calif.

C. K. HALE, M. D.

SANE AND CLEAR IN ITS OUTLOOK

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In my opinion the one activity which absolutely must be kept up is the publication of LAND AND FREEDOM. Without that I would feel totally lost. It is the only first class publication we have in this country which keeps us in touch with Single Tax activities all over the world and it is so sane in its outlook and clear in its statements that it is a joy to read it. For all this I thank you personally.

Fort Atkinson, Wisc.

CHAS. B. ROGERS.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

THE State Unemployment Committee of California recently met at Sacramento and declared with due solemnity that the unemployment evil is a menace to the State, that it causes waste and lasting harm to the community, etc., etc. But no effort was made to determine the cause.

A LETTER from Waldo J. Wernicke in the *South Pasadena News* urges that assemblages be called together to ask that a bill be presented in the legislature to collect a \$1. rental upon every dollar of land value increase due to water and power development, and so forestall a monster bond issue.

HAMLIN GARLAND was the principal speaker at the recent meeting of the Ulster County Historical Society which met at Saugerties, N. Y. on June 5.

THE Free Trade Federation of Japan publishes a monthly journal *Jiyuatsuho*, at 118 Osaka Bldg., Osaka. It contains messages from leading business men urging the removal of trade barriers.

A BILL introduced in the California legislature proposing to disfranchise all save property owners from voting on irrigation projects has been defeated. Charges have been made that Harry Chandler, owner of the *Los Angeles Times*, was the principal supporter of the bill.

BETWEEN eighteen and twenty thousand Americans kill themselves annually.

"HERE is a subscription for your unrivalled paper," writes Jerome Underhill, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

ROBERT E. URELL, former postmaster of Mansfield, Pa., was eighty years old on June 4 of this year. He is a member of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, the Henry George Foundation, the International Union. He is a constant writer of letters to the newspapers on the Single Tax.

EDITOR HODGKISS, of Melbourne *Progress*, writes: "Congratulations on your great work in LAND AND FREEDOM."

A RECENT sketch of Hon. Newton D. Baker, former Secretary of War, appears in a recent issue of the *Herald-Tribune* of this city. The article recounts his association with Tom L. Johnson and calls him "a ruthless fighter for what he called special privilege, and a Single Taxer."

OUR old friend James Malcolm, of Albany writes: "Your May-June number is full of good things. The world is in an awful mess. How blind are the leaders not to see the sovereign remedy. It looks as if the coming winter will be worse for the unemployed than ever and the prospect makes those in fairly secure circumstances tremble for the outcome."

HAROLD SUDELL has written a letter to President Hoover in which he says: "In your Monday's speech at Indianapolis you say 'Our American system holds out the major purpose of a state to protect the people and give them equality of opportunity.' You have used this phrase on a number of occasions. Might I ask you as a special favor that you tell me just what you mean by it?" It would be interesting, wouldn't it?

WE have received an announcement of the graduation of Miss Virginia Huppert Ryan, of the Senior Class of Cornell, on June 1. This young lady, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William Ryan, as a baby was the darling of the Manhattan Single Tax Club when she crawled over the desks and was greeted as "Ginnie." We are certain that many of her old friends will wish her a brilliant future, of which a gratifying proficiency in her studies is a real assurance.

THE Eden, Auckland, New Zealand, *Gazette* announces the retirement of Fowlds and Son after a business activity of forty years, a retirement brought about by steadily increasing high rents which slowly strangled the industry. Sir George Fowlds at a luncheon given in his honor said: "I bear no grudge and voice no grouch, and I include the landlords in the general exoneration. So long as the people of any country believe in the private appropriation of rent, landlords are entitled to it; but the people of New Zealand have gone absolutely crazy on the subject of rents, and we are victims of that temporary insanity."

THE *Daily Colonist*, of Victoria, B. C., in its issue of June 20 gave column report of the address of Alexander Hamilton before the Henry George Society of that city. Excerpts from this address appear in this issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

EDMUND VANCE COOKE, well known poet and lecturer, sends his subscription and says: "There is no magazine to which I renew my subscription quite so willingly."

NICHOLAS A. VYNE, of Camp Verde, Arizona, has passed away very suddenly from a heart attack. For a long time he has published a Single Tax paper which was constantly growing in interest and importance. He wielded a vigorous pen and was a man of sterling courage. He had looked forward to resigning a small official position he held to devote his whole time to travelling about the State, lecturing and distributing literature. We remember Vyne in the earlier days of the movement and spoke with him at open air meetings in this city. He was a picturesque character and his language, because of his vigorous expression, might at times require some editing. He was a Rough Rider during the Spanish-American war and his friend, Captain "Bucky" O'Neil, at that time mayor of Phoenix, Arizona, himself a believer in Henry George's principles, was killed at his side during the battle of San Juan. We shall miss him, for he was one of those to whom the title of moral hero and devoted soldier of a great cause belongs.

JOHN H. MEYER, of Fresno, California, appears with a number of well written letters in the *Fresno Bee*.

A SPECIAL anniversary edition of the *Johnston Democrat*, Pa., was issued on June 3. The history of the paper is given, as also a review of the changes that Johnstown has seen in the last thirty years. It is a notable issue of a great newspaper, and the sketch of the life of its founder, Warren Worth Bailey, reveals incidents of a career that was remarkable in many ways. The paper has been true to its traditions in these years, and its character can be said to have been determined by this bold, fearless journalist who had a style all his own, and made the *Johnstown Democrat* what it is today.

FREDERICK L. SIDDONS, Associate Justice of the District Court of the District of Columbia, former law partner of Jackson H. Ralston, and long an active Single Taxer, died suddenly in June of this year. He has not been active in the movement of late, but his long years of service to the cause have not been forgotten. A week before his death he presided over his court. His body was cremated in accordance with his oft-expressed desire. He was a man of high ideals, and his long career in public service, his legal acumen and profound knowledge of the law, had given him a high standing in the community. He is survived by a widow and a son and daughter.

OUR friend, Louis F. Weston, of Cambridge, Mass., writes us enclosing the paper started by L. D. Beckwith, "No Taxes," and urges that those who can write appealing letters should do so asking their friends to send subscriptions and or at least to write for sample copies. We of which we heartily endorse. Mr. Beckwith's address is Stockton, California, and his paper is well worth the support of Single Taxers. He wields a pen that is mightier than the sword, has a vigorous style all his own and knows his economics.

HARLES H. CLESS, JR., secretary of the Glens Falls Chamber of Commerce, and a convert of James R. Brown, sends forth every now and then some very intelligent discussions of current topics to the newspaper press. He touches upon various points of interest, and in a recent mimeographed copy of this newspaper service writes as follows:

"In the neighborhood of fifty years ago Henry George propounded the Single Tax proposal. His suggestion of a tax on land values was at that time radical and heretical. Some may even think so today but more than one part of the world there is a tendency toward the adoption of that policy. In some sections it is already in full force and successfully. It has now been incorporated in the policy of a nation. The new budget submitted by Philip Snowden, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, goes into effect in 1933. 'By this measure,' said the Chancellor, 'we assert the right of the community to ownership of the land. If private individuals continue to possess a nominal claim on land they must pay a rate to the community for the enjoyment of it. They cannot be permitted to enjoy the privilege to the detriment of the community. The world will soon be able to more adequately judge the validity of another great economic and social experiment.'

BOLTON HALL writes us that a recent book, "Humanity Uprooted," has been recommended to him by Don Stephens who has spent several years with the peasants in Russia, and by Lawson Purdy. John Dewey is in his preface to this work that the writer is neither pro-Bolshevik nor anti, and that neither a communist nor a foe of communism can find much support. Mr. Hall says: "Consequently it is as interesting as Steffens' Autobiography, giving a vivid picture of Soviet life. Books that can make radicals though with little reference to the land question are not plentiful, so I pass on the recommendation of this book to our fellow Georgists."

THE Manhattan Single Tax Club has made arrangements with Station WHAP, operating on a wave length of 1300 kilocycles, for James R. Brown to speak over the air every Sunday night from 10 to 10.30.

AN article from our old friend Andrew MacLaren on "Why Labor Taxes Land" appears in the *Labor Woman* of London, England.

DR. C. J. LAVERY, of Aberdeen, South Dakota, writes in the *Dakota Free Press* a long article supporting Calvin Coolidge's recent article on taxation in which the latter pointed out the folly of attempting to tax wealth and said very wisely that "taxes have to be collected by the rich before they are paid." A correspondent having found exception to this remark calls forth from Dr. Lavery a keen criticism and defence of ex-President Coolidge, who for once at least seems to have been right in his economics.

THE Land Value Press Bureau, of London, has issued a number of telling memoranda on the amendments to the Snowden Budget proposed by the opponents of the Bill. The opposition took the position that as land values were taxed under "Schedule A" of the Income Tax the proposed penny in the pound involved "double taxation." To this assumption, of which much was made, Mr. A. W. Madsen and F. C. R. Douglass replied, leaving not a shred of defence to the supporters of the amendments. But think of those who uphold the present system of taxation opposing any measure on the ground that it involves "double taxation."

"LAND AND FREEDOM is always good but your last two numbers are exceptionally so," writes G. Frank Kelly, of Scottdale, Pa.

THE *Boston Financial News* has discovered the cause of hard times. It says: "The surest cure for economic depression lies in greater gold production." As in May of this year we had the largest amount of gold that this country has ever known we ought to be very prosperous. But we cannot eat gold and a number of our people were hungry. To distribute a few bars of this precious metal and to ask the hungry to chew on them would doubtless, in the opinion of the *Boston Financial News*, appease their hunger. What's the matter with these people?

THE *Fairhope Courier*, of Fairhope, Alabama, published in wide column measure the Fourth of July oration made by Henry George in 1877.

IN our last issue we printed a letter from Charles H. Ingersoll outlining suggestions for work, which we entitled "An Ambitious Programme." One feature of Mr. Ingersoll's programme to which he now wants to direct attention was a Letter Writing Division of a Publicity Bureau. It is Mr. Ingersoll's desire to secure a correspondent in every State to co-operate in this effort. The initial work, he explains, will be the organizing of letter writing activity to be supplemented by lists of papers which have published Single Tax letters or other favorable matter. Who will venture to start the work in collaboration with Mr. Ingersoll? He will want copies of papers as well as letters published where available, and opinions of those who have had experience in this kind of work. It is his desire to thoroughly systematize this activity and to bring it to that point of efficiency to which in the days of Charlie Ryan, of Philadelphia, it measurably attained. Mr. Ingersoll's experience as an advertiser has given him many ideas on the subject which he wishes to test out. He thinks that a demonstration may be made that will have big results. His address is 545 No. Arlington Avenue, East Orange, N. J.

"LAND AND FREEDOM is a splendid publication, and it is most unfortunate, especially at these times, that it cannot have a much larger circulation," writes Charles G. Merrell, of Cincinnati.

To the growing list of Single Tax letter writers is to be added Foxhall A. Parker, of Lancaster, Pa., who in the *New Era* of that city has a letter in which he quotes a magnificent statement from Volney's "Ruins of Empire."