

September—October, 1931

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

*An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901*

The Coming Henry George Congress

October 12—13—14

The Passing of James R. Brown

The Budget Debates

Mervyn J. Stewart

Philip Snowden's Great Speech

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

*Digitized by Microsoft®*



# 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.

## SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1931

VOL. XXXI

No. 5, WHOLE No. 168

### 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 .....	131
THE BUDGET DEBATES..... Mervyn J. Stewart	136
OUR AUSTRALIAN LETTER.....Percy R. Meggy	137
OFFICIAL NEWS OF CANBERRA.....	141
REPORT OF LECTURES AND WORK OF JAMES R. BROWN	141
RADIO TALK ..... John Lawrence Monroe	145
PHILIP SNOWDEN'S GREAT SPEECH.....	146
GOLD MINERS' PHILOSOPHY..... E. P. E. Troy	147
PASSING OF JAMES R. BROWN .....	149
BOOK REVIEWS.....Oscar H. Geiger, B. W. Burger	150
CORRESPONDENCE .....	154
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	156

## 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

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1931

No. 5

## Comment and Reflection

ONE of the earliest real estate booms of this country was that of John Law, and had for its territory what is now the State of Louisiana. The methods pursued were surprisingly like those of today. New Orleans was described as a land flowing with milk and honey. The first rude settlement was pictured as a magical city, a land of palm trees, of gold and silver mines, of rich vineyards. In Parisian cafes wholly imaginary pictures were exhibited of the newly found Eldorado, and Frenchmen parted with their holdings in France to invest their money in Louisiana lands.

THE ships that carried these unfortunate investors from France landed at Dauphin Island. They found neither food nor shelter and remained to starve, for, the ships having departed, there was no escape. The few that survived secured plantations that were granted out, and some prospered. Slaves were imported from Santo Domingo and the West Indies to work these plantations. The inevitable association of slavery and land monopoly was established, and today members of the land-owning aristocracy of New Orleans are drawing revenues based upon the titles whose origin dates from this wild episode of the land speculation of John Law which left a train of misery in its wake.

THE slavery following on the eve of land speculation resulted in the usual way. The Natchez Indians, having been treated with consideration by the first governor general of the colony, were friendly. But the attempt made to enslave them by his successor, Perier, who drove them from their lands, resulted in a wholesale massacre, in which nearly three hundred perished, and so land grabbing and slavery wrought their accustomed fruits.

THE force that has counted most in the industrial history of America is the vast unoccupied land that until a comparatively recent period offered unlimited opportunity for settlement. Those who were disposed to minimize the influence and importance of the land question will do well to consider that our entire civilization would have resulted differently, and our system of government altered to something quite the reverse of what it is today, had it not been for this vast unoccupied land which beckoned to the Eastern settler. Suppose the land had

been owned and occupied—that all these fertile lands lying westward on which towns and cities sprang up had been subject to land monopoly. Labor would have paid the blackmail long before it did. But development would have been immediately arrested and civilization halted this side of the Mississippi, perhaps even to the present day.

HOW the hearts of men must have thrilled to the prospect of these boundless and unappropriated acres! Their effects upon wages and labor conditions are hard to realize. In 1807 began the great Western trend which filled up the Northwest. The embargo and the war had interrupted American commerce with Great Britain and prosperity had slackened. The stream of emigration to the Ohio Valley and the Northwest continued from 1811 to 1817. American wages in the East responded to the impetus. The ideal conditions in the Lowell factories described by Dickens in the '40s, the higher wages prevailing here, and the greater independence of the American workingman as compared with his European brothers, are to be traced to the influence of the frontiers. Even before the Confederation Adam Smith had noted the fact of the higher wages prevailing here, and with his usual insight had assigned the true cause—Free Land Made America.

IT is obvious that where land is cheap free labor will be scarce and highly paid. It is sometimes asked how it was that slavery took root in the New World. *It was the creation of landlordism—a direct outgrowth, indeed.* Land being free and wages high, a substitute for free labor must be provided. The direct connection of free land with the growth of the institution of slavery is not generally recognized by political economists. But just as slavery ceased to exist because it became economically unprofitable to the masters of industry, so in the same way it originally arose out of landlordism. Slavery was a fruit of the same evil tree as the final degradation of free labor. It is interesting to note that in this emigration movement the South was scrupulously avoided. The reason is plain. In the South the land-cost to begin farming was greatly in excess of the same cost in the Northwest. Here again is the fruit of landlordism and its concomitant, slavery. The South was deprived of that healthy emigration which enriched the West and the Northwest, and it left the South with its homogeneous and unprogressive population. Landlordism



and its outgrowth, chattel slavery, have more than their direct evil results to answer for.

**H**ERE is a syllogism which we commend to professors of political economy and statesmen of all nations: The first law of civilization is cooperation. Ergo, anything that interferes with cooperation is an obstacle to the advancement of civilization. Among the things that interfere with cooperation, make it difficult or prevent it altogether, are (1) the private appropriation of the rent of land and private control of natural resources; (2), tariffs, whether for protection or merely for revenue, and (3), wars, which are wholly destructive of all cooperation.

**T**HIS is all any statesman needs to know, but it is just what all statesmen do not know. It will probably surprise most of the heads of government to learn how brief a programme founded on this syllogism will do for their purpose. It would also surprise them to learn how brief a programme would send their names thundering down to posterity as first among the world's emancipators!

**I**F cooperation is the law of civilization, how utterly futile are the machinations of cunning statesmen looking to national advantage or pre-eminence in power. Every such attempt must defeat itself, for it looks not to cooperation but to selfish rivalry. There is "a place in the sun" for every nation, and no nation can shut out the sunlight from another, or monopolize a greater amount of "sunlight" for itself, without injury to its own interests. But that is chiefly what the statesmen of various countries have been trying to do. All the arts of diplomacy have been bent in this direction; all the various devices to enrich themselves have seen nations impoverished by the very methods by which they sought to impoverish others.

**I**T follows that if cooperation is the law of civilization, its real field is the society of nations economically bound together, organized for mutual help and reciprocal exchange. Its field is as wide as the world. This does not mean any artificial union of states. Nations are bound together by economic alliance that natural law has declared from the beginning—an alliance that is not the creation of governments, and not even needing their sanction, but inherent in the nature of things and depending upon individual buyer and seller.

**T**HIS cooperation of society, of man as a trading animal looking for some one who may do the things needing to be done, or qualified to provide what he needs, lends enormous strength to the theory of human brotherhood. There is no room for enmity when it is realized that men of all nations are bound together in an economic alliance, one with another. It is only when governments seek to

ignore this natural alliance that they face disaster or come to grief.

**F**REE traders have written well and earnestly, but this larger aspect of the question has seldom been sufficiently emphasized. Indeed, to most people the vision has been denied. But it means more than the destruction of tariff barriers—it means living in accordance with the laws upon which the perpetuation of civilization depends. And indissolubly associated with it must go the common participation in that social fund which arises from the growth of civilization which economists call rent, and which is more popularly called land value. For the cooperation called civilization breaks down or is destroyed when the social fund is monopolized by the few, or is unequally distributed.

**M**UCH of this vision is clouded by the more obvious aspects of industrial life, which seem to distort the picture and dim the perspective. Chief of these is the apparent helplessness of the man who works for wage. Yet this is only one of the results of the failure of society to grant the right of access to natural opportunities. Mines, forests, building lots, agricultural areas, have been withdrawn from use save at prices that labor cannot afford to pay. For the wage worker the world has been made that much smaller. The field of cooperation has been circumscribed. The laborer finds fewer bidders for what he has to sell—his labor. The remedy is to throw the opportunities open to use and to increase the area over which cooperation resulting from the union of labor and land may start afresh. Think what the effect would be were it to be announced tomorrow that a new continent had been discovered! But here at home is news that should be even more welcome. For here lies a continent ready to our hands, a continent that needs not to be subdued or wrested from a state of nature, but beckons to us right at our doors with all its infinite riches. And all that is needed is the exercise of the power of taxation to sum up into use the vast unused portions of this outspread continent!

**T**HOSE who think they are thinking are prone to remind us nowadays that this is the machine age, and that this fact offers an explanation of the hard times and unemployment. It does not occur to them that during the prosperous times of two or three years ago—we were as prosperous as these same men understand prosperity—we had nearly as many machines—we have not added much to the number. Wherefore this sudden dislocation between producer and consumer where machines lie idle and men beg for the privilege of working them? It is not the machines but the plight of the consumer—who, were his demand effective, that is if he were able to buy goods that were produced in response to a demand that would set the machine at work—that evidences a break in the economic



machinery, an interruption of the true functioning of buyer and seller. A failure to sense this as the real cause leads to what we may call the socialistic interpretation of the phenomena. We have never listened to a Socialist talk without hearing something of the supposed effect of machinery. If we remind him that a sewing machine, in the machine sense, is as truly a machine as is the locomotive, we submit ourselves to raucous laughter. Yet they are both part of the process that lightens labor, and were its full effects not minimized by other causes would tend to prevent all unemployment.

FROM the earliest times every age has been a machine age. The progress of prehistoric man has been roughly divided into (1) the Stone Age, (2) the Bronze Age, and (3) the Iron Age. The man of the Stone Age relinquished his ruder methods when he discovered that his machines (his implements) could be made of bronze, and later of iron, in more enduring form. Roughly speaking, he continued to discover improved machinery in this order: stone, bronze, iron. Every time he discovered a new machine, or new material for his machines or tools, the human race moved forward. He never thought of looking at the process as a calamity. It was reserved for a more subtle generation to regard this law of human progress as operating in some way to make it harder for the worker. We do not believe that the men of the Iron Age commiserated with their brothers and expressed regret that they had not lived in the simpler age of stone before bronze and iron implements had thrown them out of employment!

NO machine ever threw a single man out of employment. What occurs is the temporary displacement of labor. But this is inevitable and in the long run tends to right itself in the effective demand resulting from decreased cost of manufacture. Narrow-minded trade unionists do not set this—so they fulminate against the machines and the employers. These men are the direct descendants of those who mobbed the Hargreaveses and Arkwrights for inventions which in the long run enormously increased employment. Labor unions have their justification, but their real genesis lies deeper than William Green suspects. Least of all is the machine the enemy of labor. Bitterly as many of the leaders of labor are opposed to socialism, their attitude is really the socialistic one. They add enormously to the socialistic appeal. They keep up their shadow-boxing with an invisible enemy and keep repeating their insane twaddle about the machine. How many men did the locomotive put out of employment? How many the sewing machine? How many the linotype? And learned writers echo all this twaddle by characterizing ours as the "machine age," and stopping there, leaving the cause of unemployment and widespread industrial depression resting upon this fragile foundation. Suppose the masses should take seriously these learned gentlemen

and start out to demolish the institutions which centuries of progress have built up?

THERE is this to be said, if not precisely in extenuation of the attitude of labor and the host of writers who think machinery is in some way inimical to labor, but as in a measure explaining this curious misunderstanding. John Stuart Mill came near the truth when he said it was doubtful if machinery had lightened the labor of the working masses. The reason, which Mill himself did not clearly see, was that perhaps the greater share of this improvement in industrial processes goes to swell economic rent, or the value of land, and this is monopolized by the few. Every labor-saving device contributes to the further enrichment of this small group controlling the natural resources, and labor, to which otherwise the entire benefit would accrue, sees a large and perhaps the largest portion of this increase of wealth gravitate into the hands of the privileged few.

CAPITAL, or forms of capital allied to land monopoly, or armed with some sort of legal privilege, is able to secure for itself a portion of this constantly increasing wealth due to improved machinery. But it is doubtful if capital *per se* can command any of it. It may for a time, because of labor's divorcement from land, the sole means of employment, obtain control of the labor of the workers, but not for long. Eventually capital is as weak as labor itself until it moves for the control of some natural resource. Not even combinations without some legal or natural monopoly, though they may thrive for a time, can earn large dividends unless the services they perform are outstanding. Woolworth and the chain stores, largely due to mercantile genius, are examples of combinations that exist because they deserve to exist. It might be argued that even here not a little of their success lies in the fact that they minister to the poverty of the people, and that in a state of universal abundance they could not hope for the same success. With this contention we are not disposed to argue. Certain it is that some force is lent to the argument by the fact that Woolworth, the chain stores and the "automats" have felt very lightly the present depression.

GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, of New York, is no wiser than his fellow Governors in his official remedies for unemployment. He suggests an increase in income taxes to provide funds for public improvements on which the unemployed may be set to work. To this and kindred proposals it may be anticipated that the Communists, being no more reasonable than other folks, will offer strenuous objection. Yet it is of a piece with communism, of course—a fact which advocates of forcible division of wealth will not be able to discover. It is unpleasant to refer to Mr. Roosevelt and his fellow Governors, advocates of these and similar schemes, as Communists;



but what else are they? The real Communists are a little more thorough, that is all.

**J**UST in what degree additional taxes upon incomes may further increase the burdens acting as a deterrent upon industry, and thus deepening the prevailing depression, is of course impossible to say. But even if the influence is little or more, and even though it be true that income taxes, because they are not capable of being passed on, do not increase cost, neither do they add inducements to enterprise, but, if effective in any way, act rather as discouragements. The defect of all these proposals, useful as temporary expedients though they may be, is that they are simply a postponement of the evil day. It is a process of piling up obligations for the future. The more we try to evade the true economic solution the greater the price we must pay. How much longer can we ignore its insistent call?

**T**HE proposals for tax exemption of new buildings by Mr. Wm. J. Diles, of Palisade, at the Fort Lee Borough Council of New Jersey, called forth the following communication from Mark M. Dintenfass of Grantwood, which was published in the Fort Lee papers:

"The proposal of exemption of taxes on new buildings and new endeavors in our borough by some of the realtors and builders came to my attention through our local newspapers.

"A splendid idea, although not at all new! As a substantial taxpayer and for the good of our borough, I wish to further this question by personally bringing this important matter to the attention of your honorable body with the following comment:

"New building immediately makes the wheels of commerce move, gives new employment, opens up factories and increases payrolls which support the local tradesmen; brings new people into the community, which increases land values, benefiting the borough, the people in general and the real estate owners in particular. I am sure this is known to the honorable mayor and council. Personally, I know of no better way to build up a community than by untaxing new endeavors.

"We know that the exemption from taxes on new homes in New York City was a big success and a great benefit, and that the exemption of taxes for new buildings has been a benefit and a success wherever given a chance. We also know that a number of cities and towns in Pennsylvania have prospered because of the fact that not only were they exempt from taxes for a period, but even the ground was given free to encourage new efforts. I am therefore 100 per cent for an arrangement which will benefit men who help to build up our community. They should be free from taxes.

"I am certain that the people who have the interest of the borough's success at heart, will not only be for this proposal but will bend every effort to bring it to the attention of others.

"I therefore respectfully request your honorable body to give this matter your earnest consideration and take advantage of the opportunity that is now apparently knocking at our door."

## The Budget Debates

**T**HE first and vital thing to be said in discussing the Budget talks is tribute and honor to Chancellor Snowden, who has never wavered in the great moral principles laid down in the Budget speech: that the land-value tax is a restoration to the public of their own in symbol. Everyone except Georgeists and Socialists three months ago held that land owners represented the Creator and were fully entitled to all they could get out of those omitted from the Divine Plan. The Socialists (following the American substitution of "eminent domain" for the British common law of land rights) held that neither land owners nor anyone else were entitled to anything if the Government desired it. Hence, "Quadragesimo anno."

Today, age-long British law has been vindicated by a powerful Cabinet Minister in the office where infringement has been a constant policy.

Snowden, with his astonishingly dexterous and well-informed helpers, Sir Stafford Cripps, solicitor general, and Pethick Lawrence, financial secretary, has definitely established our doctrines, and so far as one may judge has conceded no serious economic principle except in one case which at most is doubtful and meant probable defeat if contested.

The question of exemption from land-value tax was, of course, discussed at great length. The policy of exempting "the agricultural value of agricultural land" and minerals has been only challenged in principle by Georgeists—there is no obstacle to a wiser House of Commons amending this in the future; for the present moment it tends to simplify and expedite the valuation which is to cover all valuable property. (Who can value minerals when and where the mining industry is not solvent?)

Other concessions made in debate are likely to be permanent and have deep social consequences. They refer to land controlled by charities, educational bodies, religious bodies; used for sport; and amenity land to which public access is permitted. (The big issue raised by Liberals of "double taxation" will be considered later.)

### CHARITIES

It is agreed that land held by or for charities, which are controlled and supervised by the Charity Commission (a department of state), shall be exempt from the land-value tax exactly as income tax is refunded in all cases to such charities. This is frank recognition of the fact that such charities, subject to public accounting and control are performing state functions cheaply and well in a public sense. The conditions of income tax exemption are now well understood and defined by a series of judicial decisions.

### EDUCATION

Here a similar position begins to appear. From the great and ancient Universities of Oxford and Cambridge to the private school of a few pupils with some social or personal popularity there is a vast network of educational bodies



more or less independent of the official Board of Education. Exemption from the land-value tax of their land holdings on generally similar terms to charities will tend to bring all who think it worth while under the supervision of the board—with, of course, a certain measure of loss of autonomy. Modern socialism by free will emerging as soon as a touch of Georgeism gives it a place whereon to stand!

#### CLERICAL

A further stage is indicated in exempting denominational lands from land-value tax—this would have rejoiced a Becket, Langton, or Grosseteste! By all above precedent a result must be that accounts and records of churches which register land as "tax free" must come "gradually and inevitably" under the control of the Ecclesiastical Commission; which will be little to the taste of some who are exulting in the escape from the levy of a tax at present of trivial weight. But a very good thing indeed for the supposed beneficiaries of church funds, though a far greater loss of autonomy than suffered by schools. This will have the most searching effects of any church law change for four centuries or so, reviving Plantagenet controversies. Better to pay, perhaps!

#### SPORTS

Another set of ideals are next to be considered. In view of the inadequacy of publicly controlled spaces for games and recreation, the opinion grows that permanent dedication of sports grounds in private control is so desirable that it is well to offer exemption of the tax to *prevent* use of the area for building, etc. Even if not quite permanent, it is seen that temporary use of odd bits of ground for games is a public benefit and the capitalized tax will fall on the sale price should it be wished to commercialize such areas, as well as (perhaps) five years' back taxes on ending temporary dedication.

#### AMENITY LANDS

Similar to this is a feature of British life which is today more valued than perhaps ever before. Many people of wealth maintain and control "non-economic" gardens and pleasure grounds to which the public are admitted when at their best (very frequently for a small fee to nursing or other charities). Mr. Snowden has refused in cases such as this to make any exemption from the tax, but has offered that any such concession made by owners can be registered with the local authority and shall be strongly considered in assessing the taxable value of the "land unit."

These matters are of interest and importance in themselves. They are the result of debate and seem to be an agreed national policy. The implications are astounding. Mr. Snowden is not a Georgeist, but he has definitely broken with the obsolete bureaucratic and brutal socialism of the post office, national railways and police variety. As soon as he lays the foundation stone of a Georgeist tax law we see arising from it a structure of the new and

good sort of socialism—private enterprise and control, at private risk, supervised and co-ordinated (in some way at present unsettled) by public officials in return for public financial concessions. Syndicalism can grow in such an atmosphere, or a co-operative commonwealth; or if under just conditions private enterprise quite unfettered is the strongest course, it has only to renounce its exemption from the land-value tax. The Chancellor is a great Socialist of the forward-looking school, and finds in Georgeism a solid base on which a free state with all the co-ordination which Socialists advocate can come into existence; it is quite possible that he has killed the old dream of a socialist slave state on a base of private or public land monopoly, so far as Britain is concerned. By one Budget Bill!

#### THE LIBERALS

The saddest feature in the whole debate is the Liberal position. The June, 1931, issue of the *Liberal Magazine* was full of admirable matter commending the land-value-taxation proposals. The social and financial thumbscrews have been applied, first to Sir John Simon, a leader of the Liberal majority, who came out with an attack on the whole principle of a land-value tax, demanding reversion to the 1909-10 duties on undeveloped land and increments, which were calculated to collapse under their own weight, and did so. He has been eliminated from the roll of vice-presidents of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values. Strangely, he did not resign, but waited to be expelled.

The next victim was Mr. Lloyd George, the Liberal minority (and titular) leader, who has repeatedly warned the Chancellor against this absurd policy. His attack was far more able, and forced from the Chancellor a most costly and dangerous concession. The income tax now takes 4s 6d in the £1 (225 mills) on the assessed income from real estate of great total value under Schedule A; the penny land-value tax is a further double tax of 83 mills on the assessed income from the land itself in such cases, which is very heavy if and when improvements are considerable and themselves heavily assessed and taxed. Schedule A valuations are "confidential" and often absurdly low for landed magnates; Snowden valuations are public.

The Cabinet has accepted a Liberal amendment which has been repeatedly redrafted. There are very complex mathematical formulae by which the tax on land value is reduced to one-eighth of a penny in all cases of land most fully improved where the real estate value as a whole bears the 4s 6d income tax, and is levied at the full rate of the equivalent of one penny only if there are no improvements on the land. Thus the so-called "double taxation" is avoided. It is very clear that Georgeists will have to deal with Schedule A some day, and arrangements by which it is considered in payment of land-value tax are only temporary.

Mr. Snowden has promised this, indeed. There can be no word of defense for taxing *real estate improvements* at 4s



6d in the £1, and a land-value tax which falls on the land in proportion to the improvements on it should be replaced by an increased "Snowden tax." I repeat that Schedule A assessments are confidential, and no one but the assessor and the taxpayer knows them: only the assessor knows how assessments compare with those on other like and adjacent property. This is "to get at them rich fellers," as the "mugs" are told; but once again, the Snowden Budget has altered all our public life, and has, even in its injured form under pressure of a hostile majority, the seeds of vitality to amend all these abominations of class rule.

The crisis came on June 22, when a hostile Liberal official amendment was defeated by a bare half-dozen votes in a House intimidated on the one side by financial and social magnates, on the other by fear of vengeance from an outraged public. Every able man who could be won over by the land monopolists was employed to set out a case which never faced the real issue of preparing for the Single Tax. Heroic work was done, if a member of the United Committee may say so, by the "Tothill Street" (now "Petty France") organization, whose information service came to be eagerly sought by legislators. In several cases plausible amendments were so riddled by "memoranda" circulated to all M. P.'s who could be reached that they were never brought forward. In one case many legislators' enquiries had come for such a memorandum, delayed at printer's, and this writer was the only messenger available to take to St. Stephen's the sheets, which were eagerly seized by a distinguished M.P. for immediate distribution in the House.

The critical division once more tore the Liberal party to shreds: about twenty Liberals voted hostile, none of any importance save Mr. James de Rothschild; about ten Liberals voted Georgeist, including such fine men as Sir Robert Hamilton, Major McKenzie Wood, Mr. Geoffrey Mander, Mr. Percy Harris and Mr. Graham White, while about thirty Liberals took no part, including the whole "Shadow Cabinet"—three Lloyd Georges, David, Gwilym and Megan; two Simons, Sir John and E. D.; Sir H. Samuel, Sir D. Maclean, etc. Sir J. Simon in opposing the whole idea of Henry George's teachings avowed his desire to see them applied to municipal taxation! ("File this for reference.")

Many Conservatives were absent without seeking "pairs"—and indeed there is no fight in the Opposition; these Conservative abstentions saved the Cabinet and the Finance Bill, due largely to the tactical skill of the Chancellor in allowing two years for the valuation to take effect. Conservative leaders have "saved their faces" by strong prophecies that within two years they will be in office and the tax repealed, and so march off the battlefield no shot fired.

The Finance Bill passed out of committee as amended on June 24 by majorities of 42, 49 and 54, with an ovation to Sir Stafford Cripps; and in third reading on July 3 with 52 and "The Land Song."

The only Conservative comment, by Mr. Neville Chamberlain, expressed regret at the Liberal-Labor compromise; the principle of the valuation is accepted, as *The Times* notes with regret, "while discussion has raged on this or that trifle being taxable or not."

The greatest Georgeist speech ever made from the Treasury Bench was by the Chancellor, who laid down plans which it will take a generation to complete, on third reading of the Finance Bill. Magnificently, with a Budget sacrifice of £30,000,000 under the Hoover plan, he promised that every penny of the land-value tax would be used to reduce taxation: earlier he had said that local rating on site value should follow the valuation swiftly, and the revision of national taxes on real estate should also then be undertaken.

"This is the first real attack on the land monopoly of the country \* \* \* they had begun a far-reaching reform which some day would liberate the land for the people."

#### "DOUBLE TAXATION" AND "AGRICULTURAL LAND"

The inconvenience of the term Single Tax (which has been hated for two centuries and never bettered) is shown in the "Simon-Liberal" slogan, "No double tax on land value": *i. e.*, that any tax on land value, however trivial or unfair (as Schedule A), must exempt from any just tax. It should be itself repealed and replaced by a flat tax on Snowden valuation of equal return without prejudice to reform of municipal rating and taxes on trade and on legacies, etc.

The exemption of the "agricultural value of land used for agriculture" raises the point: has such land any *real* land value? Its selling price after providing fair wages for labor and skill and interest on improvements is largely and perhaps always composed of *unreal* elements—shooting rights, social power and prestige, the hope of future increments, and the chance of unknown minerals, which are as illusory as the building values which to some extent arise wherever automobile cars can travel. Such influences we may hope will tend to lessen under the Snowden Budget even if they escape some of the tax which is their due.

Lastly, as I began, all credit to the Socialist Chancellor who has done more with a difficult Legislature than any Georgeist could have done, and under criticism has found strength and safety in relying on our bases in words always more direct and clear.

MERVYN J. STEWART.

THE angle has been tri-sected. That's one problem solved. Many social problems still seem to defy the master minds—or is it the best minds? One of these problems seems to be triangular in form—we have idle lands, idle rich and idle poor.

Perhaps some one can explain the relation of these and tell us if they are corollaries—AND HOW!

JOHN J. EGAN in *World-Telegram*.



## Our Australian Letter

### LAND VALUE TAXATION—MUNICIPAL AND FEDERAL

PEOPLE often ask what progress, if any, the Single Tax is making in New South Wales. We have long given up the hope, which we once cherished, that the advent of the Great Reform preached with such fervor by Henry George was at last within sight. Since his visit we have learned from experience what a long and dreary road has to be traversed before we even get a glimpse of the Promised Land. We have been specially deceived by the Labor Party, which we at one time thought was going to back up the movement for the abolition of land monopoly and the introduction of free trade; but that hope we have had to abandon.

It is true that in the municipal sphere the Georgian principle has been enforced in both Queensland and New South Wales, as well as in many other parts of Australia, but in the Federal sphere it has been so mutilated by the Labor Party that, instead of being the most equitable, it is the most inequitable tax we have. All land up to and under £5,000 in value is exempt, while all land value over that amount is supertaxed to make up for the loss sustained by the exemption. Recognizing what a hotch-potch this was of the Georgian principle, all the other parties—Nationalist, Country Party and Independent—adopted it, seeing that, so long as some land was taxed and other land was supertaxed, land monopoly would flourish more than ever and all hope of undermining or abolishing the evil would be squashed. In fact, the exemptions and graduations introduced by the Labor Party and supported by all the others have made land monopoly even worse than it was before, and done us irreparable harm in other ways.

Then it slowly dawned upon us that the only thing left for Australian Single Taxers to do was to educate the people on the right lines and endeavor to get the obnoxious legislation repealed. To carry out this purpose Single Tax papers have been established in at least four of the States—New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia; meetings in the various capitals have been regularly held in connection with the different Leagues, and especially in the Sydney Domain, where all sorts of reformers—Socialists, Communists, Anarchists, Protectionists, Single Taxers and Red Ragers—proclaim their principles every Sunday afternoon to more or less admiring crowds. The Single Tax Leagues also have classes for public speaking and for the reading of "Progress and Poverty," weekly lectures and addresses are delivered, and country tours are organized by the secretaries of at any rate two of the Leagues—those in New South Wales and South Australia.

### MR. HUIE'S COUNTRY TOUR

Mr. E. G. Craigie, M.L.A. for Flinders in South Australia, the secretary of the South Australian League, has

done some splendid work in that direction, his successful carrying out of which was mainly due to his election to the South Australian Parliament, where his speeches on the land question have made those ancient fogies, his fellow members, sit up with a vengeance. Mr. Hobbs, a business man in New South Wales with a remarkable capacity for expounding the Single Tax, has interested large audiences throughout the Mother State, while Mr. A. G. Huie, our indefatigable secretary, has just completed a lecture tour, details of which I now propose to give. I will only premise by saying that the work of education has been immensely strengthened in the Mother State and elsewhere by the generous donation of £20,000 by Dr. Culley, an American physician long resident in Melbourne, which has enabled the various Leagues to considerably augment their work, besides offering prizes for essays on the subject and publishing them in leaflet form. Mr. Huie commenced his tour this year on January 8, when he left Sydney in the "Lizzie," a motor car presented to him some years ago by one of his admirers, and spent five days in Goulburn, which he describes as "the most favorable to the Henry George cause among all the country centres in New South Wales."

### A BRILLIANT SINGLE TAXER

I never was in Goulburn, but I remember very well the days when the *Goulburn Evening Post* was edited by the late Mr. Hebblewhite, one of the most brilliant writers on the Single Tax in Australia. Recent editors have followed in his steps and frequently publish articles and letters denouncing Protection and advocating the Single Tax. "The abject failure of Protection," writes the secretary, "and the complete falsification of the promises of its most blatant exponents have at last quieted the advocates of trade restriction. You can slate the tariff in unmeasured terms and large audiences do not raise a single protest." Many of the residents at Goulburn signed a petition in favor of proportional representation, "the feeling in favor of electoral justice being strong, and is irrespective of existing parties." The abolition of P. R. in New South Wales was a reactionary step which Single Taxers have had much cause to regret. Its abolition was mainly owing to the faulty manner in which it was put into operation, the "improvements" with which it was saddled being the principal cause of its non-success. But proportional representation, in connection with non-party government as carried out in Switzerland with marked success, is, in my opinion, a great desideratum in many other countries besides New South Wales.

### DECLINE OF THE RURAL POPULATION

After leaving Goulburn the secretary touched at Braidwood, a centre he had never previously visited, and near which there is a good country which could be put to better use. The rural population, he says, is declining. In 1926-7 there were more than 800 fewer rural holdings in the southern table land than in 1920-21. The secretary next visited



Canberra, but as I dealt fully with his remarks on this part of his tour in my article on Canberra, I will pass on to the neighboring town of Queanbeyan, which has much altered and improved since his first visit many years ago.

At Yass, one of the principal cities, by the way, in the running for the capital, the secretary specially noticed the demoralizing effect of the dole. At one place near by the police inspector told him that it occupied four hours of his time daily in administering the dole. There are camps near the towns where the men stay. "In all centres," the secretary points out, "there is work about a town which might be done with advantage. If men did half a day's work, or a day a fortnight—a day a week would be better—they would be earning what they get and the town would have something to show for it." This idea has since been favorably commented on and is being put into operation in various places. The men themselves generally prefer it, although it is, of course, opposed by the trade unions, and especially by the communistic element, which denounces it hip and thigh.

The secretary had an attentive meeting at Carcoar, where things are bad and many are on the dole. He pointed out that there was nothing wrong with the country and that unemployment was due to shockingly bad management by politicians. He mentioned that when the first section of our railways was under construction the work was held up for two years for want of men. In those days there were more jobs than men. One of those present, eighty-five years of age, said he remembered the fact very well and added that they had to import men from England to finish the job. "Now," said the secretary, "we have more men than jobs, although the country is capable of supporting 100,000,000 of people."

#### SOME PERSONAL REMINISCENCES

Mr. Huie next went to Bathurst, "the Queen City of the Plains," remarkable for its beautiful situation, its delightful climate, at any rate in all but middle winter, and for its popular park. I have many personal reminiscences of Bathurst, where I first met the late E. W. Foxall, a friend of Henry George's and a former great champion of the Single Tax in New South Wales. I was editor of the *Bathurst Times* when Mr. Foxall delivered a lecture there. He was then spending his holiday in lecturing on the Single Tax in several country towns. It was one of the finest lectures on the subject I ever heard, the lecture itself being singularly lucid in style and the delivery exceptionally good.

I was very enthusiastic at that time (as I hope I am still) and managed to interest the city Aldermen in favor of rating on unimproved land values instead of on improvements as was then the method in use. They all signed a petition in favor of the change, which was afterward made law by Sir Joseph Carruthers, who is still alive and will always be gratefully remembered by Single Taxers for his Local Government Act, in which the Georgian principle

of taxation was embodied for the first time. If I remember rightly, Mr. Foxall had just come from delivering a lecture at Lithgow, a mining town where the late John Farrell, the Australian poet, was at that time editing the local paper as the accredited organ of the movement for Land Nationalization, a name which was afterward changed to Single Tax. Farrell flooded the paper with abstruse articles on the subject which were far too deep for the simple-minded locals to understand. He thereby ruined the paper, which was subsequently bought by Mr. James Ryan, a thorough Single Taxer (now a member of the Legislative Council), who knew the value of local news and under whose management the paper became a great financial success.

He was and is a good speaker, a born journalist, whose lucid editorials were always a pleasure to read. On leaving the *Bathurst Times* I subsequently went to Sydney with an article on "Municipal Rating" in my pocket which I read before the "Nationalization League" and was in due course elected its first paid secretary, the name of the League being shortly afterward changed to Single Tax, with the result that we got rid of a whole lot of Socialists, Protectionists and Land Nationalists, weakening our numbers but strengthening our morale. From that time to this we have always presented a united front and advocated land value taxation, or rather appropriation and free trade, without a single dissident in our ranks.

#### A LADY PRESIDES

Mr. Huie's second country tour commenced on February 12, when he went to Orange. Happening to stay near a college, it was suggested that he should give the boys an address, a procedure which has been carried out in the United States by Single Taxers with marked success. Backed up by the Mayor, the principal of the college made no objection, and the senior boys assembled in the library, where they received what the secretary had to say very well, and the principal bought a "Progress and Poverty." Mr. Huie then addressed an open-air meeting, at which for the first time a lady took the chair.

#### THE PRIMARY PRODUCERS AND THE TARIFF

During his stay in Orange the Primary Producers had a big meeting, attended by delegates from all parts of the district. The principal speaker was Mr. Abbott, an ex-M.P., who mentioned some of the disabilities of the mer on the land, but omitted to mention the tariff, whereupon Mr. Huie, during the five minutes he was allowed for the discussion, tackled Mr. Abbott for neglecting to deal with the tariff, although he had promised to do so, and said he could not understand why the Primary Producers were not all howling free traders. "They had to sell in the world's market and take what they could get, while they had to buy in a highly protected market and pay twice as much as their requirements were worth. Their interests had been sacrificed for the benefit of the protected manufacturers."



What I had to say, observed the secretary, "met with general approval."

Mr. Huie next visited several places round about. "The wheat country," he writes, "is feeling the full weight of the low prices now ruling for the staple product of so many farmers, who were deceived into planting additional land by Mr. Scullin. Russia," he adds, "is naturally a wheat-growing country and was a large producer before the war. Latterly she has again become an exporter. As other countries had increased their production, the price is now low, and the Protectionists complain about Britain getting cheap wheat. If Russia by dumping chooses to pay part of the bread bills of the Britishers there is no logical reason why they should complain. Those who get dumped Australian sugar do not complain about getting cheap sugar.

"Australian farmers must realize that they cannot pay £10 and £12 an acre for land, support protected monopolists in cities by paying them twice as much as machinery and supplies are worth plus excessive railway freights, and expect to sell wheat at a profit. Wheat will pay if the growers are given a chance. No country has such natural advantages for growing it as Australia. But the land must be cheap, the machinery and supplies must be the best that the world can afford at free trade prices. And railway freights must be drastically reduced. That is the only way to make the industry pay under normal conditions."

And what the secretary says with regard to Australia applies just as much to the United States.

#### IN THE WHEAT BELT

Forbes and Parkes are rival towns, both of which got their start through the discovery of gold. Parkes has the advantage of not being landlocked like Forbes. "Forbes has always been friendly to our cause," writes the secretary. "It was there that the first organized attempt was made to further George's principles in New South Wales. Of the early pioneers John Cashman and J. J. Patterson remain." The next step was to Trundle, where the secretary had not spoken previously. "It is a small centre in good wheat country," he writes. "It is almost painful to be touring at the present time. Everywhere men are out of work, business is bad, and the instability of political conditions aggravates the position." Condobolin, the next place visited, is "friendly to our cause and always gives me a good meeting. It is a landlocked town. It has the river and the railway. It is well situated to be a big centre—when the land within a reasonable distance is put to its best use."

One of the best public meetings the secretary had during his tour was at West Wyalong, where there are several Single Taxers. The secretary was there shortly after the discovery of gold about thirty-seven years ago. Today wheat and not gold is its mainstay. At the public meeting referred to was "an irrepressible Protectionist—the first I have struck on this tour. This man is a farmer, yet he

refuses to see that farmers are victimized by the tariff in the interests of city manufacturers. He asked many long-winded questions. My answers appeared to give satisfaction. Nobody seems to take him very seriously. Facts were all against his pretensions. For thirty years we have had an ever-rising tariff, which is highway robbery by the Government, and today we have a record number of unemployed. So far as farming machinery is concerned Protection is primarily for the benefit of one firm.

"According to the Tariff Board, under 5,000 workers are engaged in making agricultural implements and about 230,000 using them. When the late H. V. McKay passed out he left £1,437,000. 'What,' I asked, 'did the average farmer leave?' 'Debts,' someone replied. Moreover, when the cost of production was low the H. V. McKay firm was able to make and export agricultural machinery to the Argentine. With the increased cost of the tariff and the cost of production they lost all their Argentine trade. What did they do? They took some of the money they had looted out of the farmers of Australia and went to Canada to set up a factory to employ Canadians so that they could supply cheap machinery to foreigners."

#### VITAL NECESSITIES

While the secretary was at Temora a great demonstration was held at Wagga in favor of seceding and forming a Riverina State. Talk like that, writes the secretary, is only hot air. Even if it were practicable it would not lessen the cost of production and transport, which are the vital necessities of the farmers today. Why don't the promoters of these gatherings go straight for what they require instead of playing into the hands of their political enemies? If new States were set up it would not lessen the cost of government and the real curses of the Primary Producers—the tariff and land speculation—would remain in full force."

#### THE CURSE OF THE DOLE

Mr. Huie's third country tour commenced on March 12, when he first went to Cootamundra. In the course of his visit he touched on the dole. "According to the Assistant Minister for Labor and Industry, Mr. Ely," writes the secretary, "the dole is costing the State over £3,000,000 a year. This gives the taxpayer no return, as well as having a permanently demoralizing effect. Surely there is a way of providing some honest work for an expenditure of £3,000,000! This huge waste is proof of the moral and intellectual bankruptcy of present-day politicians. There is plenty of work waiting to be done. There are bad stretches of road between good portions. Towns need water and sewerage. Trees must be planted in suitable places. Noxious weeds could be dealt with, and so on. Every man getting food should work for it. Most men would prefer to do so. According to the Minister 25 per cent of the dole goes to persons not entitled to it." (This aspect of the question has been thoroughly gone into of



late, and a large number of persons have been found guilty of misappropriation in connection with the dole.) "Work would weed out those who are merely loafing upon the Government's efforts to prevent people starving. The expenditure upon the dole if used upon the roads would make an appreciable and welcome improvement."

#### JUNEE AND THE MONOPOLIST

"Junee is one of the most striking examples in the country of the evils of land monopoly," writes Mr. Huie in *The Standard* for April. "Originally the site of the town was a 640-acre selection taken up at £1 per acre. When it was decided to extend the railway westward it was necessary to keep well away from the Murrumbidgee. So Junee was selected as the most suitable place to make the junction for the line to Narrandera and Hay. Then the man who had the land demanded his pound of flesh. That family has been a heavy burden upon the place ever since. The landlord's tribute and the ill-shapen town have afflicted Junee for more than fifty years. This town supplies one of the most notable examples of the beneficial effects of rating on unimproved values. When the new system came in early in 1908 the land monopolist got it in the neck for the first time. He richly deserved it. The effects were at once apparent. Land that home seekers formerly could not buy was soon made available on easy terms. The land owner was looking for people to take the land and use it. Local Government rates, however, only take part of the economic ground rent, so there is still a good deal for the monopolist."

#### A PROMISING RECRUIT

While I was transcribing the above a young man called on me in a motor bike on his way to Sydney to help Mr. Huie in his campaign. He was young, enthusiastic, and longing to get some experience as a speaker in our cause. How I envied him! He said his name was Whaling. By a singular coincidence, on continuing my perusal of Mr. Huie's account in the *Standard* of his country trip I found the following extract: "The next stop was Coolamon . . . In the afternoon Mr. Whaling, Jr., from Ashfield (which Mr. Huie has several times contested in a State election), turned up. He was working in the district and got half a day off for the purpose. He considered it was necessary that I should have some questions to answer at the meeting, which was well attended. At last I said to him, 'You had better talk to the people yourself.' And he did. It was his first attempt and he did very well. I feel sure we have a fine young recruit in Mr. Whaling."

#### A WITTY RETORT

Mr. Huie spent four days at Wagga, a fine town where fifty years ago he went to school, and where he had a good meeting. In moving a vote of thanks Mr. Colquhoun, who is now an enthusiastic supporter, told the meeting that just over five years ago Mr. Huie came into his office

and he (the speaker) gave him 2 shillings to get rid of him. The paper for which that was the subscription came along, and at first it was unopened. Then he thought it was no use paying 2 shillings for a paper without reading it. So he read it and he could see how much there was in Henry George: "It was what the country people really needed." In explaining the evils of land monopoly at Holbrook, showing how idle land meant idle men, the secretary mentioned that in the Sydney district there were 80,000 vacant areas adjoining water mains worth £20,000,000. "And how many of them do you own?" said a man with a grave face. "None," I replied; "mine is in the cemetery, and I am in no hurry to occupy it."

#### THE TOUR REVIEWED

The fourth and final section of the tour was commenced on April 8, and included such places as Corowa, Deniliquin, Leeton (where the secretary was "moved on" by the police), Griffith, where he addressed a meeting of the Constitutional Association on "The Tariff in Relation to Industry," one of the best meetings of the tour, and finally Lake Cudgellico, where he lived for fifteen years from 1883 to 1898, and where the last meeting of the tour was held. During the tour a lot of Single Tax literature, especially "Progress and Poverty," was sold, old subscribers to *The Standard* renewed their subscriptions and new ones were obtained, but above all, wherever the secretary went the local papers, which are much more democratic than the city ones, published interesting reports of his addresses, and frequent letters on the only way in which the social problem can be satisfactorily solved. Mayors and other leading personages were generally available to preside at the open-air meetings, and many a convert has been won from those who, without understanding our creed, were willing to listen to what was said, and it was no uncommon thing for a chairman at one of these meetings to eventually become an ardent supporter of the gospel according to Henry George.

Culcairn and Lockhart, two places visited by the secretary, had only one thing in common—the well-to-do land owner and the landless laborite. Albury, on the border between Victoria and New South Wales, is one of the most favorable centers in New South Wales to proclaim George's teaching. Among those he met at Albury was the wife of the Methodist minister, who was a daughter of the late Edmund Lonsdale, formerly a member for Armidale and one of the straightest Single Taxers in New South Wales who held up our end of the stick in Parliament as no one has done since, and who could always be depended on to convince the farmers that free trade was the best policy for the man on the land. The secretary pointed out that the farmer is not in difficulties because the land is bad. On the contrary, "it is as good as ever and has superior climatic conditions to those prevailing in competing countries. But the land cannot carry hot-house town industries, a multitude of taxes and excessive railway freights



Our appeal to the people is to wipe out taxes, use land rent as a public revenue, and so put things upon a free and natural basis."

PERCY R. MEGGY.

Thirroul, N. S. W., Australia.

## Official News of Canberra

THE following is a letter addressed to our Australian correspondent, P. R. Meggy, by Mr. G. D. Burgess of the City Administration Department of the new Australian capital:

I desire to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of your letter of July 22nd, 1931, together with a copy of the May-June, 1931 issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. The interest you have shown in Canberra, by writing the article for a journal of world-wide circulation, is appreciated.

Your facts appear to me to be right, and the story of Canberra is told in a favorable light. However, there is an error in a paragraph at the bottom of page 74 which may give a wrong impression regarding the site of the City. The highest hill within the Canberra City Area is only 2,762 feet above sea level. This is Mount Ainslie in the northeast corner. Another, Black Mountain, is 2,658 feet above sea level. The average height of the Canberra City Area is about 1,900 feet. Some confusion may have occurred between the height of hills in the City Area and the mountains on the western boundary of the Territory, the highest point of which is Mount Bimberi, 6,264 feet above sea level. The actual height of Mount Srtomlo—not "Stromolo"—is 2,567 feet. The river running through the site of the City is spelt "Molonglo," not "Mononglo."

In the paragraph relating to provisional buildings the impression appears to have been given that a War Memorial Museum has been erected, but this is not so. Although the construction of an Australian War Memorial and Museum has been proposed and a building scheme prepared, it has been deferred for reasons of economy until the present financial depression has lifted. There are, however, several public buildings in Canberra which are worthy of being noted besides the Parliament House, Government House and the Prime Minister's residence. The most notable of these are:

The Australian Institute of Anatomy, which contains a museum housing the collection of unique samples of Australian fauna presented to the Commonwealth by Sir Colin MacKenzie, the first Director of the Institute.

The Entomological Laboratories and Administrative Buildings of the Institute of Scientific and Industrial Research.

The Australian School of Forestry, which was established in the Territory for the training of expert forester; and

The Albert Hall, which serves the purpose of a Town Hall and a Theatre for dramatic and musical entertainments.

THAT we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us—that we should respect the rights of others as scrupulously as we would have our rights respected, is not a mere counsel of perfection to individuals, but it is the law to which we must conform social institutions and national policy if we would secure the blessings and abundance of peace.—HENRY GEORGE.

## Report of Lectures and Work of James R. Brown

HERE is an account of our lecture work from the date of the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. The report ending July 20 gives a record of 154 lectures up to that date, with auditors numbering by count 15,489.

The unusual heat of the past summer had the effect of lessening the number of meetings and speeches, but we can report thirteen addresses from July 20 to Sept. 8, as per this list:

July 21....	Gladstone, N. J.....	Chamber Commerce
July 26....	New York, N. Y.....	Radio Talk
July 30....	Perth Amboy, N. J.....	Exchange Club
Aug. 2....	New York, N. Y.....	Radio Talk
Aug. 9....	New York, N. Y.....	Radio Talk
Aug. 11....	Tuckahoe, N. Y.....	Lions Club
Aug. 13....	Hackensack, N. J.....	Kiwanis Club
Aug. 16....	New York, N. Y.....	Radio Talk
Aug. 23....	New York, N. Y.....	Radio Talk
Aug. 26....	Asbury Park, N. J.....	Rotary Club
Aug. 30....	New York, N. Y.....	Radio Talk
Sept. 3....	Caldwell, N. J.....	Kiwanis Club
Sept. 8....	Port Washington, N. Y.....	Lions Club

As a result of the radio addresses we have received about 100 letters asking for literature as to the Single Tax, and also some personal visits to the office for literature and further information.

Our newspaper work has gone on in the same satisfactory manner as at the start, and the newspaper treatment of my addresses has been kind in attitude, generous in space. Unsolicited letters of appreciation of our work are regular and constant, and indicate growth of an enlightened opinion as to what the Single Tax really is and what it would do as a solvent of our social troubles.

We have many calls ahead of us to respond to and to tell the wondrous story; and one thing is certain—if we state our case plainly, in language that the hearers use and can understand, and without any tinge of fanaticism, in due time we will have no dearth of believers and advocates, particularly among persons who have the advantage of some degree of education.

This summer we were delighted with a visit by Prof. Herman Thomas, of the University of Richmond's economics department. He was accompanied by his wife and sister-in-law—a trinity of real Virginians. I am from away up north, but I must confess I like Virginians—that good old Saxon strain has a courage and strength in it that counts for progress. Prof. Thomas is a sincere and intelligent Single Taxer. We lecture to his classes on the occasions of our annual visit to the University of Richmond. I am frequently told that the students and faculty enjoy my visits. If so, I rejoice.

Another visitor this summer was Prof. Joseph M. Klamon, of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. This man, only thirty-four, with a splendid academic training as a background, promises great things for the Single Tax.



He is so earnest, so capable, so well balanced. I asked him for a sketch of himself and his contact with our movement, which is given herewith:

"Joseph M. Klamon, LL. B., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; A. M., J. D., Ph. D., Yale University. Taught Yale, Harvard Graduate School; Simmons College, College of William and Mary; Carnegie Tech.; now professor of economics at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

"My first vital contact with the Single Tax movement was in 1925 when I was head of the department of economics at William and Mary. During the second term of the academic year Mr. James R. Brown came to William and Mary and delivered a notable and most inspiring series of addresses. He impressed the student body as no speaker that year had. The Dean of the School of Business Administration urged Mr. Brown to return as often as he could. During the entire time that I was at William and Mary Mr. Brown came regularly twice a year and did extremely effective work in enlisting the interest of our students in economics in the problem of taking community-created wealth for community purposes.

"While in St. Louis recently Mr. Brown not only spoke before a number of classes in Washington University, but he also delivered two addresses at Harris Teachers College and before a large meeting in Sheldon Memorial Hall for the Ethical Society of St. Louis. Harris Teachers College telephoned to me at Washington University and asked to have Mr. Brown as a speaker, after they heard the enthusiastic reports of his excellent work at Washington University.

"Mr. Brown has a rare capacity for holding the interest of any audience he may be speaking to.

"The best tribute to the thoroughly effective and interesting manner in which Mr. Brown lectures before universities is the fact that he is always urged to return wherever he once speaks."

At an informal dinner Oscar H. Geiger, Dr. George Raymond Geiger, Harold Benedict and Joseph Dana Miller were privileged to meet Prof. Klamon, and all were delightfully impressed by him. When once his shyness is overcome he is vastly entertaining and gave us evidence of how valuable a teacher of the great truth he is and what a force he is destined to be.

It is interesting to note in connection with the work of Prof. Klamon that a recent order for literature filled by the Manhattan Single Tax Club for Dr. Klamon's economics department of Washington University at St. Louis included 171 books and 783 tracts and pamphlets, a total of 954 pieces of literature!

Herewith is a letter from the secretary of the Kiwanis Club at Caldwell, N. J.:

"Allow us to extend to you our sincere thanks and appreciation for a very interesting and at the same time humorous address delivered at the weekly luncheon of this club today by Mr. James Roger Brown, president of your organization.

"We can assure you that we would appreciate another visit by Mr. Brown at some time in the future to tell us more about the aims of your club.

"JOHN S. THROCKMORTON, JR., Secretary."

I was pleased to receive a letter this month from Dr. Robert Norwood, rector of St. Bartholomew's P. E. Church, one of the largest, richest and most influential churches of the country. Dr. Norwood as a preacher is glorious in his courage and mentality, and is beloved by all. No one can listen to him without being lifted upward to

better thought and better living. Dr. Norwood does not live a narrow, cloistered life; his is a broad life and he has a vital interest in all questions that touch life, individual, social and economic.

In a letter to me dated Aug. 3 he said: "How good of you, my dear Brown, to send me your brilliant little pamphlet on 'The Pyramiding of Land Values.' You would have been delighted could you have heard a group of us the other day talking about Henry George. Our conclusion was that this is his hour and that the financial state of the nations is demonstrating what a prophet he was. One day it will come to pass, without a doubt." And again in a letter of Aug. 29 he wrote, in answer to a request for permission to use what he wrote: "Anything I may have said in my last letter which you want to use is, of course, at your disposal. I am only too glad to be of service to you and the cause. And I loved your reminiscences of Henry George."

And thus the light spreads over the earth. Eastward, lo, the sky is full of promise of a coming day.

I will not live to see the full fruition of all this work, but I know there will be a harvest, and even now through the power of imagination I live in a world redeemed by Single Tax from strife, worry and suffering caused by wrong thought on taxation.

I enjoy this work immensely—never an unpleasant moment. In the sixteen years of my journeying back and forth, east and west, north and south, I cannot recall an unhappy experience in any of my contacts with those I met at universities, colleges, schools of all kinds, service clubs, chambers of commerce, boards of trade or churches—just one continuous pleasant experience. This indeed cannot help but make one happy.

[Note.—Any one wishing literature, lectures or communion may address Manhattan Single Tax Club, 1860 Broadway, New York City.]

I purpose making an auto trip across the continent this autumn. A number of lectures are already arranged for in California, and along the route we hope to make many. John S. Maclean of Columbus will provide the transportation with his splendid car without cost to me, and Charles H. Ingersoll may go with us to help. This trip, like all other work, depends upon our funds. We expect to start about Nov. 15 and take about thirty days to reach Los Angeles. Full notice of lecture dates, both going and returning, will be sent out.

JAMES R. BROWN.

NO statesman has yet discovered a way to burden industry with billions of dollars of taxes without reducing purchasing power of consumers even more. Yet these statesmen cannot understand why purchasing power has been reduced to the extent of causing a depression.

A FREE country is one in which industrial depression never occur.



## On to Baltimore, October 12th to 14th

ARRANGEMENTS are now virtually complete for the Sixth Annual Henry George Congress which is to open in Baltimore October 12th, and reports coming to the offices of the Henry George Foundation indicate a keen interest in the approaching national conference, which is again being held on the eastern seaboard close to the larger centers of population. The convention committee is not yet prepared to publish a final programme for the three-day session, but gives assurance that the programme will be of a high order. The array of speakers will include several of prominence who have not appeared at any of the five previous congresses held under the auspices of the Foundation, as well as a number of others who have been popular speakers at the gatherings in recent years.

President Charles G. Baldwin of the Maryland Tax Reform Association, who has been spending the summer in Europe, will return home to Baltimore just in time to open the convention on the morning of the 12th and will also serve as toastmaster at the annual banquet on the evening of the 13th. He will bring the very latest news from across the sea, where land value taxation has recently been made a very live issue, especially in Great Britain.

Hon. David J. Lewis, Tariff Commissioner under the Wilson administration and now representing the Sixth Maryland District in the national House of Representatives, will be the principal speaker at the annual banquet in the Lord Baltimore Hotel and will speak on "The Tariff," a subject which is again coming strongly to the front in American politics and which Congressman Lewis is particularly well qualified to discuss in a fundamental fashion. Other speakers at the banquet will include Frank Stephens, the veteran Delaware campaigner; Clayton J. Ewing, the aggressive President of the Chicago Single Tax League; Lee Francis Lybarger of Mifflinburg, Pa., a prominent figure in the movement in earlier days and author of a valuable treatise on the tariff; and possibly Mrs. Anna George de Mille, Honorary Vice President of the Foundation. Senator Clarence C. Dill of Washington and Senator Robert J. Bulkley of Ohio have both expressed a keen interest in the Baltimore convention and there is a possibility that one of these distinguished law-makers will appear at Baltimore if his engagements permit.

Mr. Stephens has been assigned to discuss the immortal theme "Progress and Poverty" in the light of present-day economic conditions in the "civilized" world. Mr. Ewing will discuss our present opportunities and responsibilities as American Single Taxers, with special reference to the need for nation-wide organization and publicity. Mr. Lybarger's theme will be "The Vision and Mission of Henry George."

Benjamin W. Burger of New York, who gave such an impressive illustrated lecture at the Pittsburgh conference

on the life and work of Henry George, will be the speaker at the opening luncheon on Monday, October 12th. Mr. Burger is a careful student of the Georgeist philosophy and movement and has for some months been preparing his convention address in which he will present "The Single Tax in Perspective," a theme which is expected to provoke considerable discussion.

Hon. George H. Duncan, who has worked so persistently and intelligently for land value taxation as a member of the New Hampshire legislature, will speak at the luncheon on Wednesday, October 12th, discussing "The Application of the Single Tax to Practical Legislation."

Judson King, the able director of the National Popular Government League, will speak on the fundamental character of the power question, a subject of growing interest and importance in the forum of public discussion.

Dr. J. H. Dillard of Charlottesville, Va., President of the Slater Foundation, will give a very practical talk on "Homes and Taxes," while Will Atkinson, one of our most indefatigable propagandists, will present the theme, "The Hope of Humanity."

The problem of political action for Single Taxers will be featured at the Baltimore conference, and among the more prominent speakers who will direct attention to this field of activity will be Hon. George L. Record of New Jersey, a prominent Progressive Republican, who will discuss "Politics and the Single Tax." Dr. Mark Millikin, President of the Ohio Single Tax League and member of the Hamilton City Council, will venture to suggest some "New Field for Single Taxers," the doctor being one of the faithful group who rarely misses a Single Tax conference either on the Atlantic or Pacific coast, at home or abroad.

Bolton Hall, who has for many years effectively championed the cause of Henry George on the lecture platform, will again appear at Baltimore and speak on "Your Work or Mine." Charles H. Ingersoll, New Jersey's veteran leader, will give the conference the benefit of his long and varied career as an official member of several national Single Tax agencies, bringing the delegates his best thought on the practical question of "Speeding Up Propaganda." Robert C. Macauley, editor of *The Pennsylvania Commonwealth* and one-time candidate for President on the Commonwealth Land Party platform, will give his conception of "effective propaganda."

According to latest advices, Editor L. D. Beckwith of Stockton, California, who has recently launched the new Georgeist periodical *No Taxes*, will be a prominent figure on the Baltimore convention programme. Mr. Beckwith was toastmaster at last year's Henry George Congress in San Francisco and is planning the big trip from the Pacific coast for the special purpose of addressing the Baltimore conference and meeting the Georgeists assembled there from various sections of the country.

Benjamin C. Marsh, Executive Secretary of the People's



Lobby of Washington, D. C., and one of the early workers for land value taxation in New York City, will speak on "Our Peerless Stupidity in Taxation." A representative of the Indian Commissioner's Office of the United States government will discuss the economic status of Indian reservations.

The subject of Single Tax enclaves will again receive a share of attention at the conference, with such able exponents as Fiske Warren of Tahanto, Mass.; Ernest B. Gaston of Fairhope, Alabama, and Francis G. Goodale of Boston devoting themselves to a discussion of the practical benefits of this method of collecting economic rent for the community.

Among other speakers scheduled will be Joseph B. Chamberlain, the aggressive Secretary of the Civics and Equity League of Washington, D. C.; Hon. Edward Polak, former Register of the Bronx, New York; Western Starr, well known as a prominent Single Taxer in Washington, D. C.; George Lloyd, the active Brooklyn campaigner; Hon. Wm. J. Ogden, former Maryland State Senator, and Hon. W. D. Jamieson, editor of *The Window Seat* and former Iowa Congressman.

Among the more prominent Single Tax women who are expected to participate in the Baltimore conference are Mrs. Alice Thacher Post, Miss Grace Isabel Colbron, Mrs. Rosa Kiefer, Miss Charlotte O. Schetter and Mrs. de Mille.

The afternoon of the 13th will be given over to a "Council of War," at which ways and means will be considered for a more vigorous promotion of the Single Tax movement in the United States. President George E. Evans and Executive Secretary Percy R. Williams will at this time report some recent accomplishments and present a National Programme of Action proposed by the Foundation officers. Associate Secretary John Lawrence Monroe will also appear on the speaking programme with an address that is sure to contain something of real interest. Francis W. Maguire, manager of the literature department, will be active as heretofore in pushing the sale of Single Tax books at Baltimore.

James F. Morton, who has so admirably performed a similar function at previous conferences, will at the closing session on Wednesday afternoon summarize the discussions and point out some of the lessons of the conference.

All sessions will be held at the Lord Baltimore Hotel, the city's newest and largest hotel, where admirable facilities have been placed at the disposal of the conference. Special room rates have been granted for the benefit of the visiting Single Taxers which will make accommodations at the headquarters hotel as low in cost as those offered by any other desirable hotel in Baltimore. It is hoped that as far as possible all visitors will reciprocate courtesies extended by locating there, where all business and social activities will center. Reservations should be made through the office of the Henry George Foundation, 1310 Berger Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., and the committee will appreciate

prompt advice from all who are planning to attend so that all arrangements may be made for the entertainment and accommodation of the delegates.

## Proposed Unemployment Conference with President Hoover

AN interview with President Herbert Hoover on the subject of industrial depression and unemployment and the remedy is planned in connection with the approaching Baltimore convention, and President Evans of the Henry George Foundation has appointed a representative committee of prominent Single Taxers to confer at the White House on October 15th, if an engagement agreeable to the President can be arranged.

Congressman M. Clyde Kelly, of Western Pennsylvania, is endeavoring at this time to make suitable arrangements for the reception of the committee at the Executive Mansion and it is hoped that it will be arranged for the day immediately following the adjournment of the Baltimore convention so as to insure the presence of a strong and representative committee.

Among those who have been appointed on this committee are Dr. Mark Millikin, Chairman; Clayton J. Ewing, Charles R. Eckert, Will Atkinson, Charles G. Baldwin, L. D. Beckwith, John S. Codman, George H. Duncan, Ernest B. Gaston, Bolton Hall, Spencer Heath, Charles H. Ingersoll, Frederic C. Leubuscher, J. C. Lincoln, Robert C. Macauley, Joseph Dana Miller, James F. Morton, Harry W. Olney, Edward Polak, Frank Stephens and August Williges.

The personnel of the committee is subject to definite acceptances yet to be received from several of those already named.

IF we saw in a barn-yard one bird sitting there doing nothing and all the other birds pecking and piling up heaps for that good-for-nothing bird for half a day before they could pick for themselves, we would have the condition among birds that exists among men—PALEY.

Because of his writing the preceding comparison, King George III, it is said, expressed his determination to prevent Archdeacon Paley's promotion to higher office in the Church.—*Progress* (Melbourne, Victoria).

IN the center of the division which I represent (Bristol) land has changed hands at the sum of £1,650,000 an acre. I hope the valuation will be proceeded with as speedily as possible, and I am confident that the result of the imposition of a charge which, to my mind, is only a fractional part of the increment value, will be such as to lead our Chancellor of the Exchequer, whom we have reason to believe will be found in that position for a long time to come, to see the necessity and wisdom of increasing the amount in the pound which is to be levied.—MR. ALLPASS, M.P., British Labor Member.



## Georgeism, Communism: Which?

RADIO TALK OVER WCFL, APRIL, 1931, BY

JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE

HERETOFORE this country has been considered proof against radicalism because of its large and prosperous middle class who have been living under the illusion of lasting prosperity due to the ready conversion of natural resources into quickly realizable wealth. But this condition is rapidly changing. The natural resources are to a considerable extent dissipated where not monopolized. The middle class are beginning to feel the pressure just as the dispossessed class have always felt it.

Now that the protective armor of the middle class is growing thinner and showing perforations, the march of events makes it clear that there is not a great deal of time left for the revamping of social theories that have proved themselves illusory. Communism has rooted itself in one of the world's great empires. With its inception little more than ten years ago, it stands foremost in the economic consciousness of the world today. While Communism is a nightmare to the entrenched monopolies of all countries, it is also a growing hope to constantly increasing numbers of the world's dispossessed.

The mounting cost of government and the increased exactions of landlordism are causing the middle class to discard the rose-colored glasses of the privileged for the darker-hued spectacles of the exploited. The charges of taxation and of privately appropriated ground rent are falling with telling weight upon the middle class, which are becoming rapidly dispossessed, thereby becoming easy prey to the conjuring promises advanced by communistic thought. They are coming to feel that they have nothing to lose and everything to gain.

Communism can grow only when the average man is without a means to make a living. It is only then that any change is welcomed in which there is hope for a more equitable distribution of wealth.

Individualism very rapidly becomes collectivism when men are disemployed and when families suffer from radically reduced incomes if not actual poverty. When economic power becomes so centralized that the middle class can no longer share in the fruits of privilege, this middle class turn to fight some superficial manifestation of power if enlightenment does not direct its furor against privilege itself.

Witness the independent merchants in their battle against the chain store. Oppressed by landlordism in high ground rents, by taxation in burdensome levies on improvements and stocks-in-trade, and by the power monopoly in excessive rates, the independents, by collective action, seek to destroy an industrial personification of their distress, the chain store. Oppressed by the same factors of landlordism, indirect taxation and the power monopoly, the farmers, by collective action, seek to overcome the handicap that has been set upon them.

While privilege is thought by its beneficiaries to be more safely entrenched in the United States than in certain Old World countries of the past, the people of this country are more enlightened. The people can grasp with greater clarity and act with less hesitation in dealing with proposed remedies. Therefore the real remedy must be sought and applied before the masses of the people are carried away by the false promises of Communism.

Social relationships have changed in the last few generations, but certain elementary considerations remain with which the people are primarily concerned: those of access to the land for homes and for production. The problem of the present, then, in its essentials, is one of land for the people.

The dominating influence of the land problem in history is seen from the struggle in Roman history of the fifth century before Christ down to the present time. For example, in 486 B. C. Spurius Cassius was beheaded and his house razed to the ground because, seeing the distress of his people which called aloud for a remedy, he struck at the root of privilege by proposing a return of the land to the people. A hundred years later the Licinian Laws provided that no person should hold more than 332 acres of land, the balance to be divided among the destitute landless commoners. These laws falling into abeyance, the Gracchi brothers valiantly but vainly sought to revive them in 133 B. C. And Rome went on to decay.

Nearer to our own time, in the eighteenth century, the people of France, outside of the clergy, nobles and crown, held but two-fifths of the land, and the French Revolution was primarily a demand for a redistribution of the land. In the early part of the present century the Russian Dumas repeatedly asked for the land, and it was common editorial comment in this country that the refusal of the Czar and of the aristocracy to accede to these demands would result in the loss not only of their lands but of their heads as well. How true a prophecy!

The comparatively small amount of unemployment in France is not due merely to static population, for its proportionate increase in population since the World War compares measurably with that of the United States. Nor is it due largely to after-war effects. It is for the most part due to the fact that more than 53 per cent of the French people are on rent-free land. The peasant families of France are independent social units, jealously guarding their long tradition of home ownership. There is but a small surplus class in industry, as shown by the fact that men recently were imported to complete government projects. Those who would otherwise be unemployed in France are where the people of this country could be—on the land, the safety-valve against industrial depression.

While the prospect of higher wages in the American cities has drawn many from the land, this has not reduced the price of land in productive agricultural sections of the country. The workers when out of employment find they can't return to the land. The high price of sites both in



the city and in the country drives men to the unproductive mountain and desert lands or into the labor markets of industrial centers to compete for starvation wages. Tenantry in industry and in agriculture increases yearly. Thus a dispossessed class are growing more numerous in town and country, giving rise to a blind discontent that does not recognize individual rights in its demands.

Under the Single Tax the natural advantages of individualism may be preserved by adopting that only form of collectivism which a just civilization should secure: collectivism in the appropriation by taxation of the rental value of land.

Those who would preserve the virility of American individualism *must choose between collectivism in natural opportunities and collectivism in everything.*

The history of civilization serves notice that the participants in landlordism must yield their special privilege of extortion or yield all.

This is the choice of Georgeism or Communism.

## Philip Snowden's Great Budget Speech

HERE is the speech of Philip Snowden on the passage of the Finance Bill, July 3, by a vote of 274 to 222. The Chancellor defined the Bill as a "Money Bill" and therefore it passes into law without modification by the House of Lords:

The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Neville Chamberlain), in his concluding remarks, called the attention of the House to the fact that upon the Order Paper today something like 200 names are attached to a Motion for the rejection of this Bill, and that, he said, was an indication of the views of the Opposition upon these proposals. It came as no surprise to see that. I should have had grave suspicions about the efficacy and justice and purpose of these proposals if they had received the support of that party, whose purpose was described by one of their own Members a few days ago as looking after vested interests. I can assure the right hon. Gentleman and his associates that when that day comes and we have to take the verdict of the country upon our proposals to deal with the land monopoly, we shall not shirk the issue.

Before I go further, I should like—and I have a special obligation to do this—to associate myself with the just tribute that has been paid from many quarters of the House to the invaluable assistance that I have received in the conduct of this Bill. I am grateful to my hon. Friend the Financial Secretary and to the President of the Board of Trade; and I am sure that it will not be regarded as invidious if I say that I am grateful beyond measure for the assistance that I have received from the Solicitor-General. His legal knowledge, his ability, his powers of debate have justly earned for him a high place in Parliamentary history; and his courtesy, his tact and his tolera-

tion are so admirable that even I could hardly do better. (*Loud laughter.*)

The land clauses in this Bill have emerged in a somewhat different form. I have never expected that I should be able to carry them without making some concession, but I was determined to maintain intact and unimpaired the essential principles of the Bill—and the Bill, as it will pass in the next quarter of an hour, does maintain those principles. It maintains the principle which was defined by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs (Mr. Lloyd George), of a tax upon all site values, and it maintains wholly intact the principle and practice of a valuation for arriving at the real value of all the sites which will be subject to taxation, excluding, of course, those which are exempted under the Bill. A first Measure dealing with a great and complicated subject like this is bound to show imperfections. I never expected that I should be able, as a first Measure, to produce a perfectly watertight Measure. Any Measure is bound to inflict what may appear to be injustices in certain individual cases. What we have to do is to try to confer the largest measure of good by what we do, and at the same time to try to reduce the injustices or hardships that it may entail.

We have heard a great deal about the alleged injustice of imposing a tax upon land value which the owner of land has already paid. But the House of Commons ought to realize that this land tax proposal is for the future, and that in the future those alleged injustices will not operate; because it has been repeatedly stated, and it was repeated by the right hon. Member for Hillhead (Sir R. Horne) this afternoon, that the effect of these taxation proposals will be to reduce the capital value of land by at least one-twelfth. Indeed, it may be anticipated that the reduction will be more, because, when the tax is imposed, it will be the object of the owner to sell the land, land will be thrown into the market, and competition in the sale of land will have the inevitable result of reducing its capital value.

There has been a great deal of talk about double taxation. But, if this tax raises revenue—about which the right hon. Gentleman appeared to have some doubts—something can be done with that revenue. It will be used for the purpose of reducing taxation in other directions and, therefore, there will be a reduction of taxation exactly corresponding with any increase of taxation that may have been imposed by the operation of this Measure. The scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member of Carnarvon Boroughs (the Budget of 1909) was complicated, as I think he will agree, by trying to deal with too many aspects of the question at the same time. Ours is a much simpler way and, in that respect, it is the first real attack upon the land monopoly of the country.

I hope more courageous Parliaments will in the future deal with this problem more drastically than we have done. The land monopoly is the greatest burden on industry. It imposes a tax of hundreds of millions a year upon the productive enterprise of the country, and, instead of this



tax being an additional burden upon industry, it is designed for and will have the effect of lightening the burden upon industry. The right hon. Gentleman raised the question that this tax is going to be imposed whether a profit is being made by the business that is on the site of it or not. Is not rent paid? Is not the rent of agricultural land being paid in these times of depression?

The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley (Sir J. Simon) explained what he conceives to be my views upon this question, my purpose and my principles. I take no exception to what he said, but I may remind the House that they are views of which he himself was such an ardent supporter up to a few weeks ago. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said that the Liberal party had never been identified with the principles of Henry George. The English Land Taxation League exists for the purpose of propagating the principles of Henry George, and up to a month ago, when his name was removed from the list, the right hon. Gentleman was a Vice-President.

The principle underlying this Bill is to assert the right of the community to the ownership of the land. I have never made any question about that, nor that that right should be expressed in the form of a rent paid by the occupier or rather the owner of the land to the community. As I said just now, this is only the first step in the reform of our land system. The effect of that system has been to place a burden on industry of hundreds of millions a year. It has crowded our people into pestilential slums, and it has driven hundreds of thousands of people from the land into the towns to compete with the town workers, with the result that wages have been depressed and unemployment has been increased.

I commend the Bill to the House of Commons, not only upon its financial proposals but also upon its land proposals. I think that when they come into operation their social and economic effect will be seen, but it is only the first step.

\* The party for which I speak have always put the question of land reform in the forefront of their programme. Although I may not live to see the step that we have taken this afternoon advance still further, at any rate I submit this Bill to the House of Commons with the satisfaction that I believe that we have begun a far-reaching reform which some day will liberate the land for the people and abolish once and for all the tyranny under which the people in this country have suffered.

[Editorial Note.—This address is reprinted from *Land and Liberty*, of London, Eng., and the usual English capitalization is retained.]

**R**USSIANS of today may not regret the revolution of 1917 but those of a century hence may have to endure an organization to be known as "Daughters of the Soviet Revolution." That will surely subject the reverence to Lenin's memory to a severe strain.

## Gold Miners' Philosophy In Early California

**G**OLD, gold, the lure of gold, made early California the land of romance, tragedy and economic phenomena. Henry George, in his great book, "Progress and Poverty," which he wrote in San Francisco in 1879, after twenty-one years' residence in California, shows that land value—always absorbs most of the value created by labor and capital. My story of the free, gold-mining land in California indicates that his book is a development of the economic history of California. You are now offered a copy of that book free.

The early California miners were orderly men, standing for the square deal, and opposed to monopoly. When a new gold discovery was made, the creek, gulch, flat or river was soon crowded with men. Immediately a meeting would be called, a chairman and secretary elected, and after discussion, laws and regulations adopted for the new mining district.

The first miners' laws in California are said to be those of Wood's Dry Diggings, a mile and a half long (now Auburn), where \$8,000,000 in gold was taken out of the surface dirt. There a claimant had to get on his knees and strike out with his right hand to mark one corner of his claim; then, pivoting on his right knee, he marked the other three corners. When absent, he had to leave his pick, shovel and pan on his claim, or it would be "jumpable." There being no water, the dirt had to be sifted through the fingers. A former Mayor of Virginia City told that he so located and worked his claim at Auburn in 1848. He got nothing, but a man near by found \$10,000 in gold.

The first laws allowed one person to own only one claim in a district; later, one claim by location and any number by purchase, the size then being fixed as ten feet by ten feet; but each had to be worked. Ten days' absence was allowed, if recorded. In case of sickness, each miner aided in working the claim of the afflicted one. All disputes about mining claims had to be settled by a jury of miners, even when rowdies robbed a miner of his claim by force. But the justice of the miners was swift and certain.

Miners always spoke of the gold they got from their claims as their wages. For years they prevented taxation of their claims, asserting, as does Henry George, that it is wrong to tax any one's labor. It was not until mines developed an unearned increment value in excess of their labor value that they were taxed in California.

The mining ground was free to any one who wished to work it, without any restriction except the mining district laws and customs, which made working the land the only title or right to possession. Writers of those days assert that this condition made wages higher, interest on money higher, business men more prosperous, and the cost of living lower or less than anywhere else in the world. They



all agree that California would remain prosperous, with high wages, as long as the land—the opportunity for labor—was free in the mines.

During that period a big, wholesome meal could be got in any restaurant in California for 25 cents. Antelope, deer and the choicest tenderloin beef steak cost 25 cents; fish, fresh from the river, bay and ocean, was 12 cents; and all other cooked foods at like prices.

A writer in 1858 urged that the government sell the mining land, that if the capitalists owned the mines the miners would have to work for them at low wages, and thus they could get cheap labor to develop California. In proving his point he said that a cook in a restaurant in San Francisco had to be paid \$500 per month, or he would go to the mines, 100 miles away, and easily earn that sum on the free government mining land. In other occupations a like wage would have to be paid, bringing prosperity to every business.

During that period, banks offered and paid  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent interest on demand deposits monthly; and for six months deposits paid 2 and 3 per cent a month, or from 18 to 36 per cent interest on deposits yearly. Banks charged 4 per cent a month and upward on loans. These rates prevailed for twenty-five years, from the discovery of gold until the '70s, when land monopoly began to develop.

Writers laid the prosperity of the farmer to the fact that all the return for his grain, fruit or cattle went to pay his wages and interest on his investment in home and equipment. His farm land was a free homestead-gift from the government. No speculator exacted from him any tribute for access to the land—the natural opportunity which God has given us for our living.

In 1872 Congress passed the first laws relating to gold mining, and fixed the area of a claim at twenty acres, permitting one person to take up thousands of claims, requiring only \$100 work on each claim annually. As a result of this bad law, speculators now have control of all the mining land in every State. One county recorder told me that out of 1,000 proofs of work on claims filed in his office only twenty were those of genuine miners.

Monopoly also controls all other land in city and country in California, as well as in Chicago and elsewhere in our country. This monopoly of opportunity for labor and capital results in low wages and low interest, high land value and excessive cost of living. If you wish to see these occurrences in California told in an interesting way, and early California's system of free land—free opportunity to labor—proven to be the real remedy for the present depression throughout our country, for both labor and capital, read the free copy of Henry George's great book, "Progress and Poverty."

EDWARD P. E. TROY.

1263 Oak St., San Francisco, Calif.

UNDER the best possible government there can be neither involuntary unemployment nor forced labor.

## Monument to S. Berthelsen

IN connection with the 20th Danish Henry George (High School) conference, to be held at the Small Holders High School in the village of Høng, Denmark, Sunday the 13th and Monday the 14th of September, a ceremony will take place to present a monument for the well-known propagator of the Henry George doctrine in Denmark, Sophus Berthelsen, who passed away in 1930.

The memorial is in the form of a bench and placed in the town center (facing two highways) of the village of Høng, where S. Berthelsen had his home and worked during most of the years of his manhood. It carries the following inscription:

Sophus Berthelsen

in honored memory

The faithful disciple of Henry George  
enthusiastic propagator of Single Tax (Grundskyld)  
father of the Køge Resolution  
friend of the Small Holders

The collection to erect the memorial has been sponsored by the Danish Henry George Association and the United Danish Small Holders Association, but contributions have come from other countries also: Great Britain, France, Austria, Sweden, Norway and U. S. A.

These, in their way unique Henry George High School conferences, started 25 years ago, in 1906, in the same village in which the conference is held this year.

## Emil Jorgensen's "Road to Better Business"

WE regret that Mr. Jorgensen's recent book should have presented such a vulnerable target for the critical artillery of so expert an economist as Oscar H. Geiger, who in this number of LAND AND FREEDOM (see Book Reviews) lays bare the fundamental errors of the work. Stoughton Cooley in the August issue of *Tax Facts* also levels a lance against Mr. Jorgensen and does it with great effect.

The columns of LAND AND FREEDOM are open to Mr. Jorgensen for a reply, though we do hope that he will see that he has been made a victim of an error which, as Mr. Cooley says, "has trapped many an unwary economist."

REMEMBER when a certain Secretary of Commerce, named Herbert Hoover, said in his annual report, "In the United States unemployment has ceased to be a problem"? Well, he hasn't learned differently yet.

"SATISFACTION of desires with the least exertion is the mainspring of every human action." When conditions make crime the easiest way to satisfy desires, then crime prevails. Anything mysterious about that?



## James R. Brown Passes Away

**D**IED suddenly in his 68th year, on Sunday, September 20, at the Midtown Hotel in this city, James Roger Brown, president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club.

This is the sad news that comes to us this Monday morning. It will cause a great shock to the Single Tax world from Maine to California. There will be few dry eyes among those who knew this brave soldier of a great crusade, this indefatigable worker and teacher who for sixteen years has occupied the office of president of a club which has made Single Tax history, and who for a like number of years has covered a lecture field reaching west and south and into the great cities of Canada.

Even those who differ, as Single Taxers will continue to differ, on the modes of presentation of our philosophy, will, on review of his great work, give him the meed of praise due him for the distinguished converts he has made among college professors, economists and business men. It is too early to appraise his work, as to the value of which we have received of late many surprising revelations. He was, as we said in a recent number of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, perhaps "the ablest lecturer the movement has known," and we repeat this, keeping in mind both his limitations and his rare excellences.

He wrote many pamphlets and many articles for the newspapers, and while he modestly disclaimed ability as a writer, it seems to us that his "Plain Talk on Taxation," "The Farmer and the Single Tax" and "Pyramiding Land Values" were singular examples of clear statement and straight-hitting at vital truths. They are, it seems to us, masterpieces of exposition, as were his talks before students of colleges, Rotary and Kiwanis clubs. He made friends of his audiences, in a way few Single Tax lecturers have been able to do, and this rendered easy the process of conversion. His work will go on, for he planted the seed in many an open mind.

Mr. Brown was born in Mount Forest, Ontario. He was the son of James and Helen (Rodgers) Brown. He came to New York in 1886 and soon after became a citizen. He knew Henry George and Tom L. Johnson, and nearly all the early leaders of the movement. He was one of the Old Guard and had charge of the speakers' bureau in the campaign of Henry George for the mayoralty in 1897.

The work of the Manhattan Single Tax Club will go on. It remains a monument to his high endeavors. He built up an organization whose watchword has been effective effort. He surrounded himself with men who commended his work as being on the whole the most worth-while activity being carried on, beginning with his friend Robert Schalkenbach down to the younger men who later were attracted by his personality and his unselfish labors for the cause. And he established a headquarters that was the pride of interested visitors from every country in the world.

A great leader has fallen. His worth will be recognized

in the clearer vision that death brings when misunderstandings and curious animosities have passed away.

**C**ERTAIN treatments will cure certain physical diseases. These treatments are not panaceas but that is no reason why they should not be applied to what they will cure. Does this seem like a truism? Well, President Hoover does not know it. He objects to applying the economic remedy for poverty and unemployment because he does not believe it will cure everything.

**P**UT an unemployed man naked on a desert island and he will make a living of some kind. Put him in the United States and he will starve or beg. That's why we have six million unemployed.

**"T**HAT government is best which governs least," said Jefferson. He would hardly class as the best government one which has so many laws that no one person can know them all, and has in fact thousands of laws the existence of which are unknown to every one without exception.

## A Novelist Looks at Conditions

**N**OT only the conventions of sex but of politics, caste and economics come in for Mr. Aldington's castigation. The people who pride themselves on their gentility are vulgar, self-seeking and ignorant. The well-to-do who lament the decay of England are the meanest kind of profiteers. The landed gentry moan about the burdens laid on agriculture. Sir Horace Stimms, the local squire, "last year lost 500 pounds in the Home Farm—about which he made a confoundly indecent bobbery and tried to pose as a universal benefactor to humanity. The mingy hypocrite genially overlooks the fact that he draws several thousands a year in rent for farms, buildings and land, and that if he were not a first charge on the industry the farmers wouldn't be in debt to the banks."

Review of Richard Aldington's "The Colonel's Daughter," by ISABEL PATERSON in *New York Herald-Tribune*.

**T**HE giving of charity is a confession of the failure of our economic system, because no charity is needed for a man who wants to work if there is an opportunity to work, and no charity is deserved by the man who is unwilling to work.

Thus an economic system which makes it possible for certain men to accumulate vast wealth without labor, while at the same time others who are willing to work are unable to earn a living, is unjust. Charity merely tends to perpetuate such a system with no amelioration of the suffering caused by this injustice, rather than a correction of the unjust economic condition that produces distress.

CHARLES G. MERRELL.



## BOOK REVIEWS

THE ROAD TO BETTER BUSINESS AND PLENTIFUL  
EMPLOYMENT

EMIL O. JORGENSEN

There is much in this little book to be commended and some things to be thankful for, among which are the copious notes, the well-selected list of "expressions of thoughtful people" on the Single Tax—many of which are new even to Single Taxers—and the useful facts and figures depicting present conditions, as well as some of the analyses drawn from these.

The chapter entitled "Conclusion" is especially commendable because of the material presented and the dramatic manner in which it brings home the main argument of the book.

The book comprises eighty-eight pages, divided into four chapters: "The Problem Analyzed;" "The Remedy;" "The Futility of Other Measures," and "Conclusion." The appendix consists of Notes, Some Expressions of Thoughtful People, and Books on the Single Tax and Related Subjects.

The book is recommended as the source of some very useful statistical information, but more especially as a whetstone upon which to sharpen one's economic reasoning.

The author, unfortunately, has strayed into a maze of economic fallacy in which he seems quite contented, and it has fallen to the lot of this reviewer to essay the ambitious task of indicating the errors and perhaps suggesting a way out of the maze. He undertakes the task with great trepidation but with good will for the writer of the book.

Mr. Jorgensen opens his argument with the question, "What, in heaven's name, is ailing business?" and the book is devoted to the burden of this question and to an attempt to supply the answer.

The author says "the answer is very simple," and he himself answers the question thus: "The people are not purchasing enough goods. They're not buying enough food; they're not buying enough shoes and clothes; they're not buying enough building material for homes; they're not buying enough luxuries—whether mince meat or motor cars; in a word, they're not buying enough goods or commodities of any kind. That's all there is to it."

But (and this will come as a surprise to many Single Taxers) the reason for this, according to the author, is not that wages are too low but that prices are too high.

Referring to the lack of purchasing power on the part of the people, and answering the question, "Why haven't the people got this purchasing power? Aren't wages and salaries high enough?" the author says, "Sure, wages and salaries are high enough." In referring to this in Note 1 he says: "This refers, of course, to 'nominal' or money wages only—the sense in which these terms are nearly always used. It does not, however, refer to 'real wages'—a term that is little understood by the people and the substitute word for which in this book is *price*. A careful reading of the book does not disclose such a substitute, and this reviewer must admit his own shortcoming in not being able to comprehend the term "price" as an alternative, or substitute, for "real wages." The term "real wages" to this reviewer has always connoted the idea of what money or "nominal" wages will buy, and in his experience with "the people" he has not found that lack of understanding of the term "real wages" on the part of those interested in such matters as that implied by the author's statement.

Further on in this same chapter, "The Problem Analyzed," the author says: "Low wages, it should be remembered, are always the result of general unemployment—i. e., the underbidding of men out of jobs. General unemployment, again, is the result of underconsumption—i. e., the failure of consumers to buy goods. Low wages, then, are the effect of underconsumption and cannot therefore be the cause of it."

The phenomenon of unemployment, low wages and underconsumption, resulting again and again in more unemployment, lower wages and still greater underconsumption, is a vicious circle that is well known to everyone that has given any thought to social questions; but it will be a revelation to Single Taxers who have learned to think of this entire vicious trio (unemployment, low wages and underconsumption) as the inevitable result of the withholding of land from use and of the consequent absorption of labor's product by the land owner, to hear now that low wages are the result of underconsumption.

It has always been accepted by Single Taxers that labor must first produce before it can consume, and that it was in direct proportion that labor was prevented from producing that it was hindered from consuming. And whether labor produced for its own consumption or for direct exchange or sale, or whether it produced for an employer for a money wage, its return or wage was always believed to be as great a part of the produce as the demand for labor and labor products made it possible for the laborer or producer to exact from the job or the product. Thus a man's return for his labor, whether that return was in the product itself or in money (remembering always that real wages are merely what the money can buy), that return was his wage, his "real wage," and represented his "real" power of consumption.

The author, however, does not stop with the assertion that "low wages are the result of underconsumption," but proceeds to deduce therefrom that "if the people's lack of purchasing power is not the result of insufficient wages and salaries paid to the producers of goods, then it must be the result of *excessive prices charged to the consumers for the goods*. To infer anything else is to fall into the deadly error of reasoning in a circle."

It is such characterizations as that contained in the concluding sentence of that last paragraph that embolden this reviewer to subject the author's reasoning to the light of analysis.

The author continues: "We may, then, safely say that the lack of purchasing power among the people is due, not to inadequate wages and salaries, but to abnormally high prices;" and—"The responsibility for high prices" rests on . . . ground rent or the value of land." This, then, is the answer. It is the value of land that is holding the price-level of all goods above its normal point and preventing consumers from ordering the products of capital and labor as rapidly as they desire. It is the value of land that has stagnated industry, closed factories, shut down mills, paralyzed trade, sidetracked transportation equipment and thrown millions of workmen out of employment!

## BEHOLD A NEW POLITICAL ECONOMY!

Land value that we thought was the result of industry and thrift—indeed the very measure of man's individual and communal effort and social planning, we are now told is the cause of all our trouble—land value keeps us poor—"land value stagnates industry, closes factories, shuts down mills, paralyzes trade, sidetracks transportation equipment and throws millions of workmen out of employment."

And how does it do all this? Why, by keeping up prices! The author shows that in spite of the introduction of labor-saving machinery and improved methods of production which considerably reduce the cost of production, prices yet remain high, indeed have gone higher.—According to a table presented by the author, fifty-eight standard commodities have increased in price from an average base of 100 in the period from 1840 to 1849 to an average base of 236 for the period between 1920 and 1929.

The author asks, "Now, why should this be? Why with the increase in productive power has the price-level not declined?" He answers it thus: "Simply because as productive power has advanced, the rent of ground—the value of land—has increased to a corresponding extent and thus held prices up to the altitude at which they were before."

Not satisfied with this, the author criticizes those who do not see this his way, for he says: "Strange as it may seem, this fundamental relation between high rents and high prices, or, more accurately, the



fundamental relation between the advancing value of land and the failure of prices to fall, has never been clearly recognized, particularly by the very ones who have been looked upon as the profoundest authorities on the subject. Why it has not been recognized by these authorities furnishes one of the most amazing, as well as amusing, illustrations of how the intellectuals of the world sometimes trip over the simplest and most obvious facts." If what the author sees is both "amazing" and "amusing," what should be said of the author's position in the light of correct economics?

Land value, we have been taught, is the result of the economic and cultural activities of individuals and of society; it is the measure of value that expresses man's willingness to pay for opportunity and for the services of government. It always follows, and is in a true sense the *result* of, man's needs, the government's service and the land's potentialities.

Land value is the index, and may be termed the barometer, of individual and social activities. It appears as a result of Natural Law (the Law of Rent), and it would be as high under the Single Tax as it is now—or even higher.

Commodity values, or prices, quite as obediently and as consistently respond to the dictates of Natural Law (in this case the Law of Supply and Demand). They are high or low according to the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand for it. Land value has nothing whatsoever to do with it, unless perhaps it is to interpret any marked general advances or recessions in commodity prices by itself inclining either up or down in sympathy with (and in consequence of) such commodity price movements.

What seems to trouble the author is that, in spite of labor-saving machinery and increased and cheaper production, prices still remain high. The solution should be easy for a Single Taxer. *Greater production* following the forcing of land into use will *tend* to bring prices down. Of course, the greater demand for labor as a result of that same forcing of land into use will increase wages, and thus will also *tend* to keep prices up, but the saving of more than seven billions of dollars of the modern taxes on industry and labor products which will remain in the pockets of the people, together with the then enormously increased production of wealth, which will be many times the value of the saving in taxes (and which latter the author seems entirely to overlook), will be the factors that will provide the increase in wages.

And it will be the *increased wages* (real wages, of course) due to the increased demand for labor, and not merely any reduction of prices, that will bring about the ultimate results the author desires.

The author realizes that in order to substantiate his position that high land value causes high commodity prices he must uphold affirmatively that old and fascinating problem in economics, "Does rent enter into price?" for he senses that if rent does not bear against price there could be no connection between land value (rent) and prices, the author's main thesis.

The author avers that "It is not contended in this book that rent has any tendency to *increase* prices, but simply that it prevents prices *from going down*," although in the next breath, indeed in the very same paragraph, he indicts "economists generally" who "have accepted their absurd conclusion that 'rent does not enter into the cost of production.'"

The succeeding paragraph begins: "The mischief that this preposterous idea (that rent does not enter into price—or the cost of production) which still passes for scientific truth in our higher institutions of learning has wrought upon society is beyond all calculation," etc., to the end of a long paragraph.

So sure is the author of the correctness of his position that he calls attention in Footnote No. 12 to "the same *error* that even disciples of Henry George have been guilty of." Thus:

"Ground rent is not included in the price of commodities." (Editor The Public, March 20, 1914, p. 283.)

"Rent is not a part of price." (John Salmon in the Single Tax Review Jan.-Feb., 1916, p. 47.)

"Land value has no effect upon the price of goods." (Louis F. Post, "Taxation of Land Values," p. 97.)

"Rent is not a part of price." (A. G. Huie in the Single Tax Review, Sept.-Oct., 1915, p. 297.)

"Normal rent does not enter into and form a part of price." (W. A. Warren in the Single Tax Review, Jan.-Feb., 1916, p. 45.)

"Rent, even monopoly rent, cannot enter into price, in any given time or place." (C. F. Hunt in the Single Tax Review, Nov.-Dec., 1914, p. 45.)

"Ground rent is never a factor in the cost of each unit of production." (James W. Bucklin in the Single Tax Review, Sept.-Oct., 1917, p. 270.)

"It is not true that 'the farmer who lives on the margin and sends to the mail order house for goods helps to pay the rent in the city and contributes his share in cash to urban land values.'" (George White in the Single Tax Review, Jan.-Feb., 1915, p. 45.)

"The *Ground Hog*, of Cleveland, Ohio, is doing good work in its biting, spicy comments which make interesting reading. But it should not fall into the very common error of assuming that 'if a clothing manufacturer has to pay \$20,000 more for land on which to produce his garments he will have to add the interest on this sum to the cost,' nor 'if the merchant is charged more for store rent by reason of the increased site value of his store, that he will have to add this to the final selling price of his garments.'" (Editor the Single Tax Review, May-June, 1915, p. 166.)

This reviewer wants to be as fair as it is possible and would be loath to answer or criticize the author's position on this question without incorporating in this review the author's own argument in support of his contentions. The reviewer therefore asks the indulgence of the editor for the additional space required by this already too long discourse, and hopes for the kind and favorable consideration of the reader.

Note 14, which, although assigned such subordinate position, is really a serious attempt to justify the author's position on this point, reads as follows:

"The *absurdity* of the proposition that 'rent is not a part of price' may be seen from various angles. First it is held that while land, labor and capital produce all goods, the final selling price of these goods is determined by the cost of producing them at the 'margin of cultivation,' or poorest land in use; that at this margin there is no rent to enter into price, and consequently the whole cost, or price, of the goods is divided between wages and interest. But it is mathematically incorrect to say that rent does not enter into price at the 'margin.' For the factors that unite to produce wealth here are, as everywhere else, land, labor and capital. Rent, therefore, must be an element in the price of all goods produced at the margin, for if you exclude rent as an element in distribution you are logically obliged to exclude land as a factor in production.

"Suppose, for instance, that Tom, Dick and Harry formed a partnership in business and at the end of the first month find their total profit to be \$100. Tom's share, let us say, is \$70, Dick's share \$30, and Harry's share nothing. Now, even though Harry gets nothing, it will not be argued that he is not a member of the firm or that he should be kept out of the books. On the contrary, it will be duly recorded in the books that he has received his share of the proceeds and the figure entered will be '0.' Just so with rent at the 'margin of cultivation.' Rent enters into the price of all goods produced at this margin as—zero.

"Again it is asserted that if rent were a part of price, *goods would cost more on lands of high rental value than on lands of low rental value.*

"But this is confusion worse confounded. Lands of high rental value always consist of the better grades of land, either as to fertility or as to location. Lands of low rental value, on the other hand, always consist of the *poorer grades*, either as to fertility or as to location. Now, if rent were not a part of price, goods would naturally cost less on the better grades of land than on the poorer grades. Why? Simply because wages for labor and interest on capital are fixed by the law of competition and are the same whether paid on lands of high grade or low grade.



Corn, then, that is produced by a given amount of capital and labor on very fertile ground should cost the consumer much less than corn that is produced by the same amount of capital and labor on ground that is very infertile.

"Similarly, shoes or shovels or shavings sticks that are produced by capital and labor on lands located in the centers of trade and industry should cost the consumer only a small fraction of what these same shoes or shovels or shaving sticks cost when produced by capital and labor on lands located out in the wilderness. But such a chaotic condition nowhere obtains. Goods produced on the very best lands, either in point of fertility or in point of situation, cost consumers no less worth mentioning than the same goods produced at the 'margin,' or poorest land in use—conclusive proof, therefore, that rent is a part of price."

The author in his answer to the "margin of cultivation" theory above cited loses sight of the fact that while land, labor and capital are and remain factors in production, the producing is being done by labor and capital, and that land is a factor in that it grants permission to labor and capital to work and to produce.

Also, while rent, wages and interest are in fundamental economics known as the avenues of distribution, rent, being the return to land (even if it should find its way into its rightful channel—the public exchequer), is really not distributed so far as the act of distribution to producers is concerned, but is withdrawn from production, from labor and capital, as land's share out of production for the privilege of producing. In other words, land can pay neither wages nor interest, but labor and capital must pay these plus rent.

As to Harry's share in the above bookkeeping illustration being zero and being recorded as such "on the books," economics can have no quarrel, especially as the author applies the analogy to rent at the "margin of cultivation." There being no rent at that margin, or only "zero rent," as the author puts it, then it is agreed that rent at this margin will be "zero." Now, why is it, the reviewer would ask the author, that the price of all production (of the same or similar product) on high-rent land is the same as that on no-rent land? To say that production on high-rent land should be cheaper than on no-rent land, as the author does, is entirely to lose sight of the fact that the very phrase "high-rent land" means that rent has already absorbed all the advantages of location and fertility.

Whatever advantage high-rent land has over low-rent land or no-rent land is taken by rent, leaving the net result, whether in the price of wages or the price of commodities, to be the same as that which prevails at the margin. Thus if rent at the margin is zero, and only zero rent is expressible in price, then, by the fact that rent has absorbed all the superior potentialities of the high-rent land, the author's friend "zero" can (and does) proceed unmolested into the price of all production. Namely: Rent does not enter into price.

If the reviewer may be pardoned for seeming to teach, he would call the author's attention once more to the fact that rent (economic rent, of course) is the price that men pay for privileges or opportunities, not such as have to be developed, but those that already exist. Thus, perhaps, the author may see in a new light Ricardo's statement in his "Principles of Political Economy and Taxation," that "corn is not high because rent is paid, but a rent is paid because corn is high," which the author now believes to be an error; also that "no reduction would take place in the price of corn, although landlords should forego the whole of their rents."

The author surely has no fear of opposition, although he realized he was stirring up a hornets' nest, for he gives publicity to the following opinions, all contrary to his own, and which opinions are presented by him to demonstrate "the mischief that this preposterous idea, which still passes for scientific truth in our higher institutions of learning, has wrought upon society":

"Rent is not an element in the price of products." (Prof. A. T. Hadley, "Economics," p. 470.)

"Rent forms no part of the cost of production." (Prof. E. B. Andrews, "Institutions of Economics," Chap. II, Sec. 103.)

"Rent forms no part of the price of agricultural products." (Prof. F. A. Walker, "Political Economy," p. 211.)

"Rent does not really form any part of the expenses of production." (John Stuart Mill, "Principles of Political Economy," Vol. I, B. II, Chap. 16, Sec. 6.)

"Rent is not a factor in the marginal cost of production upon which the normal price of a commodity depends." (Prof. C. J. Bullock, "The Elements of Economics," Sec. 191.)

"Rent forms no part of the expenses of production; that is, it forms no part of those expenses of production which affect price." (Prof. F. W. Taussig, "Principles of Economics," Vol. II, Chap. 42.)

"Rent is not a part of the cost of production. Wages and interest alone constitute the cost of production; indirectly, under the pressure of free competition, they constitute the value of the product." (Prof. Charles Gide, "Principles of Political Economy," p. 587.)

"We hear a great deal about the incomes of landlords and the immense sums paid to them by tenants. The sums are no doubt very great; but rent does not affect the price of products in the least." (Prof. J. L. Laughlin, "The Elements of Political Economy," Chap. 22, p. 252.)

The author's answer to this array of learning and authority is:

"Rent does not affect the price of products in the least—figs!"

"In preventing them from falling," he continues, "rent certainly does have a profound effect upon price, and if the rent were turned into the public treasury instead of going as now to private individuals the price of all products would soon make an extensive drop."

The author, of course, is mistaken; rent does not prevent prices from falling. In the general descent of prices, rent is the last to fall. You do not need to be an economist to know that; any merchant or manufacturer will tell it to you, and innumerable residential tenants occupying apartments right now under leases at high rentals while their own income have been cut down, owing largely to the fall in commodity prices, will bear witness to it. And economic rent falls after all other "rents" have fallen, as any builder or realtor will tell you; for economic rent is based on the income value of real property.

Thus rent has no "profound effect upon prices," as the author claims, and as for "the price of all products soon making an extensive drop if rent were turned into the public treasury instead of going as now to private individuals," the author indulges in imaginative speculation not all based on correct reasoning.

The author wants the Single Tax, of course, and in the book under review he says so. His error, as this reviewer sees it, lies in assigning causes for the troubles that beset society that bear no relation whatever to the effects he desires to cure.

Nobody hesitates to buy anything merely because the price of the commodity he wants is high. Indeed, there are many consumers who will not buy anything that is cheap; who have more confidence in an article if its price is high. Nor is the tendency limited to those whose incomes are particularly large and of whom it may be said, "Easy come, easy go." There probably are very few people (this reviewer's inclination is to say there are none) who do not want the best of everything and who would hesitate to pay any price within reason asked for the thing they want, provided they have the price and that the purchase will not deprive them of other things they also need and want now and in the future; for man is a prodigal by nature—as indeed is Nature itself. (The author, no doubt, still remembers that men paid \$25 each for silk shirts not so very long ago who were accustomed to wear shirts for—and who probably never before paid more for them than—Price did not stop them from buying so long as they had it and could afford it.)

The trouble is that men have not the wherewithal to procure the things they need or want or like, or if they have it today are not sure they will have it tomorrow if they spend it today. Not only the ability



to buy but the assurance that he will be able to continue to buy is what man needs but lacks.

The reason men lack the means and the security is that *opportunity* has been shut off—opportunity to work and to produce. Price has nothing whatever to do with it, unless it be the “price” that men are paid for their work and the “price” they can get for their produce. The price they pay for what they buy depends on the quantity produced, and that will be assured by the very measure that will provide the opportunity to work and to produce; and price will *follow*, not *lead*, in the succession of these events.

The author having quoted quite plentifully of statistics (all timely and instructive), may not this reviewer be permitted a reference to the most recent statistics indicating the course of commodity prices over thirty years, based on figures compiled by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics? These figures cover the period from 1901 to May, 1931, and comprise the prices of farm products, textile products, metals and metal products, building materials, etc. Taking the prices for 1926 as the base, and calling them 100, the prices for 1901 are tabulated as 55.3, and those for 1931 as 71.3, while those for 1920 are quoted as 154.4.

The phenomenon in these statistics that bears against the author's position is the slide of commodity prices from 154+ in 1920 to 71+ in 1931—a fall of about 54%.

Land values did not prevent commodity prices from falling in this period, and it did not have to be turned into the public treasury in order to permit them from making an “extensive drop.” The reason that it did not is that it could not. Land value has nothing to do with making or maintaining commodity prices. Prices, high or low, in the course of economic development, precede rent and therefore land value.

The author and this reviewer do agree on at least one proposition advanced in the book under review—namely: “We must appropriate for public purposes the rent of ground—*abolish all taxation save that upon land values.*”

OSCAR H. GEIGER.

### EQUALITY\*

One of the curiosities of English literature is Huxley's work on Anatomy. This treatise, the product of a trained scientist, discusses every phase of the human body, except the sexual. That is studiously and completely ignored, in keeping with Victorian reticence.

“Equality” is hereby awarded second place in the field of English literary curiosities. It discusses the injustices and cruelties of inequality; it shows how, in England at least, inequality is almost a religion; yet nowhere does it mention the prime inequality, from which all other inequalities spring—namely, our land system, which permits a handful of men to claim the earth as their own and extract tribute (and rent) from those who produce therefrom their food, clothing and shelter.

“Economic freedom implies both diversity of function and equality of status.” (Page 237.)

Let our author read “Progress and Poverty” and learn how utterly impossible it is to establish equality of status so long as lords of the land are enabled, without working, to draw off wealth from those who work, *for mere permission to work.*

The author reveals his woeful ignorance of economic law in many passages, of which I shall quote but two.

He writes that—

“Distribution of wealth depends, not wholly, indeed, but largely, on our (men's) institutions, and the character of their institutions is determined not by immutable economic laws but by the values, preferences, interests and ideals which rule at any moment in a given society.” (Page 45.)

Any study of political economy reveals that there are immutable laws affecting the production and distribution of wealth over which man beings have no more control than they have over the laws of physics or chemistry.

\*By R. H. Tanney: Harcourt, Brace & Co. \$2.25.

I would refer the author to a work which I reviewed in these columns in the July-August issue:

“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.” (Page 45 of Professor Brown's “Economic Science and the Common Welfare.”)

Mr. Tanney seeks to subject industry to public control. He insists that “key” industries must first be mastered. He enumerates them (page 258) in this manner:

1. Banking. 2. Transportation. 3. Power. 4. Coal. 5. Land and agriculture.

If our author knew even the ABC's of economics he would perceive that if the natural resources of the earth—namely, the bare land along with the sunshine, air and the running water—were public property, then would we enjoy true equality of opportunity, and inequality would disappear.

In the Single Tax, and in the Single Tax alone, he would learn, is to be found the method by which true equality between men may be established. I recommend that he study the Georgian philosophy and rewrite his book. Then will it be truly a work worthy of serious consideration.

B. W. BURGER.

## PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

John H. Scully, of this city, is an old and devoted Single Taxer, long active in the movement. He is not a practiced writer, and so the pamphlet from his pen, “Thoughts on Natural Law in Civic Life,” will not always bear meticulous scanning. But our friend has made his meaning clear and it is high thinking. He is a man of strong religious sentiments and would square his conception of civil life with his religious creed. In short and crisp paragraphs he has conveyed the lesson of economic justice in a way that leaves little room for controversy. We feel that it is designed to do much good, and so we have included it among the pamphlets advertised on the back cover page of this issue.

As a foretaste of this admirable pamphlet we make the two following quotations. The first is directed against those who ignorantly babble about what they term the law of supply and demand without understanding what they are talking about:

“People, when speaking about co-operation and trade, generally say, ‘Supply and demand regulate all the economic questions.’ Is there not something that regulates ‘supply and demand?’ They do not stop to think what it is. ‘Supply and demand’ are regulated according to the opportunity of capital and labor to use land. If capital and labor are obstructed from the use of land and trade is obstructed by tariff, then the natural opportunity becomes less to produce the commodities of life. These are the factors which regulate ‘supply and demand.’”

Then this happy inspiring thought:

The greatest beauty in life is the beauty of life. The most beautiful act any person or any incorporated community of persons can do is to harmonize with this beauty.

Of a somewhat different kind is another pamphlet that has come to us, “Let Us Give Democracy a Trial,” by R. E. Chadwick. Here we have carefully balanced sentences that appeal to the ear as well as to the understanding. Like Mr. Scully's pamphlet, it is an argument for the natural order. Like Mr. Scully, too, he lays down the essential principles for the establishment of the natural order; and these he embodies from the language of Mr. Louis Post. Indeed, Mr. Chadwick tells us that the little pamphlet was written to create an interest in the writings of George and Post. We are apprised that the little work comes to the readers through the courtesy of Dr. F. W. Roman.

As a sample of Mr. Chadwick's treatment of his subject the following may be cited. It embodies the feeling which all liberty-loving minds experience toward socialism, or collectivism, so called.

Collectivism—social control of the processes of production and distribution—is not to be preferred by free men even though it holds a guarantee of material comfort. Life means more than that. Life is an



opportunity for self-expression, for self-realization. It is an adventure in understanding. It is a pilgrimage of the soul. No fine phrase, no declaration or realization of equality or brotherly love can compensate for the surrender of one's self to the control of another.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE CONSTITUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. Ralston's suggestion of a campaign for a constitutional amendment in Massachusetts impels me to set forth what I know about that constitution.

The constitution of Massachusetts, from of old, requires that all kinds of property be taxed at one uniform rate. The result was, as we have read of conditions in pre-revolutionary Turkey and Morocco, that everybody used to cut down his fruit trees so as to escape paying the tax on them. And so it used to be in Massachusetts: the effort to encourage forestry in the State was balked by the necessity of cutting down all standing timber of merchantable size in some parts of the State to escape the tax on standing timber. (A hint, by the way, for those Single Taxers who would tax natural timber as a land value.) There was also great dissatisfaction with the taxation of intangible personal property.

So, twenty years or more ago, it was proposed that that provision of the constitution which required uniform taxation of all property should be repealed. The amendment made a good deal of progress in the Legislature, but was finally beaten before it came to a popular vote. As to the attending circumstances, I will now tell the story as I heard it by way of gossip, without guaranteeing anything except a faithful attempt to reproduce that gossip. The Boston Elevated Railway Company was afraid its franchise or equipment would be discriminatorily taxed if this was permitted, so they went to the political bosses and caused them to order the defeat of the amendment. The tax reform men were angry and sought revenge. They cast about for some possible action that would hurt the aforesaid bosses, and decided that the most painful punishment would be a temperance law. So they went to the temperance men and inquired what law they wanted passed. They found that the temperance measure just then being proposed was the "bar and bottle" bill, a bill requiring a liquor dealer to choose between selling liquor to be taken out and selling it to be drunk on the premises, and forbidding him to do both kinds of business on the same premises. The tax reform men volunteered to back the temperance men with enough votes to put that law over, in order to punish the bosses for the defeat of the tax amendment. And that was the way Massachusetts got its "bar and bottle" law. I repeat that I give this simply as the gossip I heard.

Anyhow, the proposed constitutional amendment was beaten; and then the tax reformers decided to attack the fortifications in detail. They brought in a special constitutional amendment to authorize relief for standing timber, and they got that. They brought in another to exempt income-producing intangible personalty and substitute the State income tax, of which in Massachusetts the principal part is the tax on the income from such investments, and they got that. And this is as far as we have yet come.

It appears, therefore, that Massachusetts, in harmony with the Ralston view, is more or less committed by precedent to reforming her tax system by specific constitutional amendment. That is what Massachusetts people are used to. But I do not see so clearly as Mr. Ralston the intrinsic desirability of such a policy as he now proposes. Theoretically I should think a better plan would be to take a State like Vermont—where the constitution imposes no restrictions and where the people have long been familiar with the policy of attracting the building and operation of factories by having towns vote to exempt them from taxation for the first ten years—and get the Legislature to allow towns a general liberty of wholly or partly exempting from local taxation any class of property they choose so long as this shall

not interfere with the equalization of State and county taxes between town and town. But I know from experience that if you simply go before the Legislature with such a bill, the Legislature will assume that your purpose is not to benefit the State but to accomplish some (very possibly dishonorable) local purpose in your town. To get such a bill through you would have to make a campaign before election and get the representatives (and, more difficult, the senators) committed to the principle before the Legislature met; and doubtless we have not enough local workers in Vermont to do that.

Ballard Vale, Mass.

STEVEN T. BYINGTON.

### SHALL WAR COSTS BE CHARGED AGAINST LAND VALUES?

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

There is one matter largely ignored, I think, by Single Taxers in their discussions as to the possibility of transferring all taxation from other subjects to one upon land value alone. They have generally forgotten differences of situation existing in this country today from those which prevailed, let us say, in 1914. They have assumed the possibility of the transfer of all taxes, including national, onto land values. Today I do not think this can be done, although it might have been feasible in 1914. The reason is to be found in the fact that a very large proportion of our national taxes is levied for the purpose of paying our outlay upon the past actual and future imaginary wars. For these purposes we raise over three-fourths of our national taxes. In return for this expenditure we give to land values absolutely nothing. The true theory upon which we levy our taxation upon land values is that the state by its operations has created and maintained such values. When, therefore, we undertake to charge against land values the cost of wars, we propose to take without rendering an equivalent and therefore attempt to reap where we have not sown. If we possessed authentic and absolute statistics upon the point, I think it could be shown that it is an impossibility for land values to meet this charge. That they ought not to be asked to do it, having been given no corresponding benefits, I think I have already sufficiently indicated.

The conditions which exist in this country prevail to an even greater extent in England, and I am prepared to accept the theory that as matters now stand it is an utter impossibility, more striking in this country than in ours, for land values to meet, or that they ought to meet, charges for war.

In our country we have wasted on the last war about forty billion of dollars. It is as much as if a sixth or an eighth of our entire wealth had been wiped out in this manner. In England the condition is, of course, infinitely worse, and it must be obvious, therefore, that the governments of today are compelled and will be compelled for many years to come to levy taxation upon industry mostly to pay for the bad temper indulged in by us in the past and expected to be indulged in in the future. For a protracted length of time, therefore, it will be an entire waste of effort on our part to protest against income taxes and inheritance taxes. Whether they be in themselves, abstractly considered, right or wrong is not important. We have had our international fling and we shall have to pay for it by methods economical subject to criticism.

Let us not any longer say, in view of present conditions, that it is within our power to levy all national taxes upon land values. In just a small portion may be so levied, but the remainder will have to be inflicted upon something else.

Of course the conditions within the States of the Union are somewhat different. For much the larger part, at least, the States have created and are creating land values fully equivalent and without doubt more than equivalent to the return they ask in taxation. Nevertheless, in the States we find part of the cost of war still collected in the shape of taxes though we are not always aware of it. For instance, in California there are veteran exemptions which should be charged to war but which increase levies upon the property of individuals who are not classed as veterans. For this the State makes no contribution to land value.



Not then, therefore, is everything done by state or national government beneficial to land values. Despite anything we may say in favor of limiting taxation to land values, our national craze for war must be paid for by industry.

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

### OH, MASSACHUSETTS, THERE SHE WALLOW'S!

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The legislative-amendment proposal of Jackson H. Ralston, as set forth in your May-June issue, prompts the following statement. Those who have read Mr. Ralston's proposal will recall that he believes Massachusetts is "the ideal State of the whole Union" in which to wage a legislative programme on tax reform.

Massachusetts long has been termed the "State of Mind" by the facetiously inclined who like to poke fun at our highbrows and educational institutions, and the sad truth is that the sacred cod's state of mind is very ordinary, despite the old-time belief that fish as food makes superior brains. For four years (1925-1929) I sat as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, representing the 11th Bristol District. As a result of my observation of thousands of legislative petitions I think that very, very few Bay State legislators, or their constituent petitioners, eat fish. In other words, intellectual Massachusetts is as good but no better than any other State.

Many years ago, about 1866, the Massachusetts Legislature enacted a "betterment tax" law which specifically provides that public improvements may be financed by assessing the unearned increment due to such improvements; consequently our State long has had the very legislation needed to save itself from financial ruin. Our people are so accustomed to the presence of this betterment tax law that the law has lost its significance except in connection with the few public services to which it is timidly applied—i. e., as to assessments for sidewalks, street sprinkling and one or two other detail services. It seems to be a common human weakness to fail to see some things which are directly before the eyes. Only yesterday I was searching for a five-foot rule which I finally found in my left hand. I did not lose my pencil because for some reason I knew all the time that it was in my right hand.

If we of Massachusetts should launch a programme for legislative amendments on tax laws we might be frustrated by a keen-witted legislator informing us that such legislation already existed in the form of the betterment tax law and our publicity stunt would be nipped in the bud. Of course, it might be a remote chance that a keen-witted legislator exists who understands the relationship between the proposed legislation and the existing betterment tax law; consequently we might "get away with it" and succeed in putting it onto the statute books twice. Such things have happened before, because legislators seemingly dislike the work of searching records. Research work presents no opportunity for spectacular publicity which politicians must have in order to attract votes, and for this reason we find these veneered statesmen annually presenting bills for doles, unemployment insurance, old age pensions, sales taxes, soft drink taxes, cigarette taxes, etc., without any search of historical records which would show the impracticability of such schemes as tried in other States and countries.

For the past two or three years Massachusetts has had a special legislative committee, comprising lawyers and real estate "experts," delving into Massachusetts' taxation muddle. The gist of the final report is that "many millions of dollars of wealth" are annually escaping the personal property tax in this State. Using the State records I have estimated this untaxed (?) wealth as being about eighteen billions of dollars. This fact, and others, I have repeatedly presented to audiences and to the press, but Massachusetts' weekly murders and racketeering command more attention. I addressed the first meeting of this special committee and urged the taxation of the unearned increment. Prior to this activity I appeared before the legislative Ways and Means Committee and made similar recommendations. If I ever again serve as a legislator, which I may do if Al Smith does not again upset

the Republican candidacies in this State with his free beer, free lunch and free air platform, I shall continue to press the point.

Perhaps this brief statement will suffice to disillusion Mr. Ralston and his readers on Massachusetts' superior state of mental fertility.

Fall River, Mass.

THOMAS N. ASHTON.

### THE HEART OF THE PROBLEM

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

We never are going to get anywhere talking Single Tax. Single Tax is a remedy, but what is the disease? Not business depression. Business depression is a symptom. The disease lies deeper. It lies in land monopoly and the constantly increasing tribute demanded for access to natural resources.

It is the Land Question, therefore, that should be harped on first, last and all the time. Never mind the remedy. It need hardly be discussed at all. First convince the people that there IS a Land Question, and that it must be settled before we can have permanent prosperity, and they will then be interested in the remedy. But until they can grasp the connection between land monopoly and business depressions, until they can see how the inflation of land values must necessarily choke business to death, it will be useless to talk to them about taxes.

Houston, Tex.

P. W. SCHWANDER.

### ADVICE TO HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Now that the Single Tax National Convention will soon be here, a few suggestions may not be inappropriate.

In the first place I trust that the convention will inspire Single Taxers throughout the country with the burning truth that only by their initiative and concerted actions can there be hope for any material results.

However enthusiastic we may be, we are apt to fall into the heresy of economic determinism. We may rationalize this dark heresy and denominate it social evolution; but such a belief tends to have the same physiological action upon the mind as do *opium religionis* and narcotics. Such a belief soothes us into a mental quietude, which finds most of its outlet in such trite expressions as the following: "So logical a system as the one I advocate is bound to come eventually, even if unaided!"

But history teaches the tragic lesson that there can be no socio-economic salvation by faith alone. An examination of history discredits Marx' famous conception of history as an impersonal flux of facts and events, in which human beings (from the genius to the non-entity) play but a very minor role.

Instead, history is a vital drama, wherein human beings play an all-important part. Even if the world be but a stage, the players must determine the nature and denouement of the drama. The voluntary abolition of slavery in America would never have come to pass, or at least would have been long delayed, had it not been for the human effort of a few determined men and women who felt the injustice of slavery.

I do not mean to imply, however, that events and facts play but an indifferent part in evolution. But we must not think of evolution as if it were a sort of *elan vital* permeating social progress. Evolution is not the cause of events and facts but merely a description of such phenomena as they are manipulated by human effort. If there is such a thing corresponding to the *elan vital*, it is human effort personified. In a word, what is termed socio-economic evolution comprehends merely the accidents of time.

These accidents of evolution are important in the sense that they furnish opportunities for and the requisite stimulation of the free play of human endeavor. This interpretation colors such phrases as "the fullness of time," etc., and gives them some significance. In all probability the American colonies would never have revolted from the mother country had England been less harsh in her political treatment of the colonies. (Canada has very little desire to revolt.) In this respect,



harsh tyranny acted as a suggestion as well as a spur to our brave forefathers, but the decisive factor was the human equation brought into play.

But unaided facts and events will not shape themselves into social progress. In India, today, there is sufficient excuse for revolt, but human effort there is not organized sufficiently to rise to the opportunity.

The lesson for Single Taxers is that the time is ripe for the acceptance of Henry George's philosophy. The serious world-wide industrial depressions, and the universal unrest which now prevails, afford the right psychological state of mind for selling the Single Tax idea. But we must not forget that the time is also ripe for communism, fascism, or even a lapse into slavery, accordingly as human effort colors the opportunity. But Single Taxers should make this their motto: Now is the accepted time.

This brings us up to the second point. Regardless of how opportunistic the facts and events may be, if there is not sufficient effort to manipulate these phenomena they will cease to be an opportunity.

Single Taxers must make the supreme effort to put across Henry George's philosophy. The convention should determine upon some plan of concerted action, so that all the world may know how we stand. I personally should prefer a plan which would have for its purpose the immediate governmental collection of the annual economic rent. But whatever plan is adopted, we should make a determined effort to carry it into execution.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

JOHN C. RHODES.

#### MR. TIDEMAN REPLIES TO OUR REVIEWER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In the March-April number of your paper Mr. B. W. B. has a kind review of my "Radicalia," but wants to know how I can include four factors in the production and distribution of wealth, and even can assert that Government's power of taxation has something to do with it? His challenge is a direct call for answer.

Well, if Finance takes one part of the proceeds of production, along with Land Monopoly, Capital and Labor, does that make it a factor in the equation? If not, what term or word should be used? Of course, the money monopoly should be terminated; so should the land monopoly, but they are anything but that now. As for the Government's power of taxation, that certainly has something to do with the people's economy when it takes about \$100 a year per head from the wealth producers (\$500 per family) in order to secure more than twice the total of that for a small group of non-producers. I think Single Taxers and some other people can and do understand that part.

The critic appears to have misunderstood the book and placed it in the wrong category. It is not philosophy, nor an attempt to demonstrate a three-cornered theory. Not as academic as that. It is just some lessons in the technic of political economy as that performs and works out in the system of our day, and also as it may be made to work by a simplification of its machinery.

To me, a mechanical engineer, the economic system appears as a vast living machine in which individuals and groups are working, all in co-operation, producing and distributing the various kinds of wealth and service that civilized life requires. In "Radicalia" I have endeavored to show how the wheels go round and the levers move, and the how and why the machinery, every now and then, becomes clogged up with wealth it can not distribute and deliver to those whose labor entitles them to it, until the motion all but stops and the producers stand helpless and poverty stricken among abundance of wealth that their labor has produced for them, and production capital, that their labor and skill have created, stands idle and themselves separated from it. Worst of all, the land with its limitless resources, is preempted and held at prices that do not admit of profitable use except with massed capital that is beyond their reach or control. It is also shown how, by slight alteration and simplification, the present machinery may be made to work smoothly, efficiently and uninterruptedly to everybody's comfort and satisfaction. I believe that is

the way the subject must be taught if it is to become intelligible and interesting to the mass of workers and voters, whose minds are trained to think on the concrete and feel in the abstract. Others may do it better, if they will prepare themselves adequately.

Single Tax should not be treated as a dogma. A dogma is a petrified concept that bars further research and progress. Political economy is a living science. No branch of science is yet finished or shows any promise of ever becoming so. To this rule political economy is no exception. The whole world is in process of evolution. That means life. Of the living things on this earth man is the unfinished species. So are his institutions. Evolutionary progress consists largely of elimination.

Fisk, Mo.

S. TIDEMAN.

#### VANCE COOKE REPLIES TO CLEVELAND PRESS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

A recent editorial in the *Cleveland Press* suggests that we need a Joseph to regulate our productions and distributions. I wonder. Joseph took advantage of a famine to relieve the people first of their money, then of their live stock, then of their lands. He then "removed them . . . from one end of the border of Egypt even unto the other end thereof," proclaiming arrogantly, "I have bought you this day and your land for Pharaoh." A fine solution that for the people!

True, in what may have been "benevolent despotism," he let them work the land for the very modest rent of 20 per cent, but like all benevolent despotisms, it did not last, for "there arose a new king over Egypt who knew not Joseph."

Doesn't it seem as if Moses might be a better deliverer than Joseph, for Moses (translating Jehovah as was his wont) proclaimed, "And the land shall not be sold in perpetuity."

It had taken Moses forty years to get the children of Israel out of the wilderness—a very small wilderness—but it had not been time wasted, for he had learned that it order to establish a nation, the land, the source of all wealth, must be safeguarded against monopoly.

More than forty years ago there arose among us a later Moses, who bore the name of Henry George. If we had followed him we would not now be in our present wilderness. The *Press* says "no solution is now in sight." If the *Press* means no sudden solution, quite right. But we do not have to go back to Joseph for the solution, but only to Moses—only to our modern Moses, Henry George. It may be another forty years' wandering, but we may just as well start now out of the wilderness by following Henry George.

Cleveland, O.

EDMUND VANCE COOKE.

#### NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

A RECENT inquirer in *Queries and Answers* in the *New York Times* asked for the poem of Ernest Howard Crosby, "Life and Death." He was answered by a number of readers. Some of our readers are familiar with the poem, the first stanza of which reads:

"So he died for his faith. That is fine—  
More than most of us do.  
But say, can you add to that line  
That he lived for it, too."

AT A special meeting of the Manhattan Single Tax Club it was resolved that the club, in view of the enlarged scope of its operations, call itself the Single Tax Society of America. Fuller details will follow.

THE *Diario Socialista Independiente* of Buenos Aires reprints the recent address of Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia, on Henry George.

THERE is no more active letter writer in the Single Tax movement than Harold Sudell, whose communications to the *Philadelphia Record*, *Philadelphia Inquirer* and other newspapers meet the eye repeatedly. He has addressed a letter to Governor Pinchot of Pennsylv



vania relating to a recent speech of the Governor at Detroit in which the latter said that what is really needed is not charity but the opportunity to work. He reminds the Governor that his brother Amos knows the answer to the problem.

W. J. WERNICKE, of Los Angeles, is perhaps the next busiest man in the stream of letters he contributes to the California newspapers. A recent four-page pamphlet against the bond issue for the building of the proposed aqueduct and water supply for Southern California we imagine is from his pen though bearing the imprint of the Commonwealth Land Party Committee. It is vigorously written and urges the taxation of land values to pay for the proposed public improvement.

CLAUDE G. BOWERS, whose special articles of supreme merit are appearing every night in the *Evening Journal* of this city, articles with which we trust our readers are not unacquainted, writes us under date of July 28: "Thank you very much for sending me the Henry George article. It begins to look as though Henry George in time will pass from the catalogue of radicals and will become quite conservative in the popular estimation."

GERRIT J. JOHNSON, whose contributions to Single Tax activities have been generous and unremitting, writes, June 22: "To me the world is an open keg of powder waiting for somebody to drop a match."

THE papers recently announced the death of Albert Sonichsen, war correspondent and the author of a number of books. He lived an adventurous life, was made a prisoner of war by the Filipino insurgents and was later in the field with the Macedonian revolutionists in 1906. We knew him well as a young man. He was a believer in the principles of Henry George and a great lover of liberty. For the last few years of his life he conducted a poultry farm in Windham, Conn., a peaceful conclusion of a more or less turbulent life.

JOHN HARRINGTON, of Oshkosh, Wis., thinking it well, as he says, to remind the public now and then of the necessary elementary truths, contributes a well-written letter to the *Milwaukee Journal* headed "Collect the Ground Rent."

PAVLOS GIANNELIA writes us from Vienna: "I greet very heartily articles like those of Mervyn Stewart and Judge Ralston."

JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE, of the Henry George Lecture Association, will shortly issue a Single Tax directory with a few pages of historical data.

THE Chicago Single Tax Club holds many interesting dinners. At one of them, on July 17, Mr. Edward P. E. Troy gave an extended account of the environment of Henry George in California at and before the writing of *Progress and Poverty*. T. A. Meyer, one of the younger group in Chicago, at another dinner spoke on "Natural Law in Economics."

OUR old friend Frank Stephens writes: "I want you to know how greatly I admire the introductory editorials in July-August issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. Both in matter and style, as ethics, economics and journalistic literature they seem to me worthy of the highest praise. Harold Sudell, who is here with me for the week-end, is of like opinion."

P. H. CALLAHAN, of Louisville, Ky., is a Single Taxer and an active worker in the Roman Catholic Church. He was for a number of years a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM. Charles H. Baldwin, of Baltimore, has addressed a letter to Mr. Callahan calling his attention to the editorial which appeared in the July-August issue of this paper on the economic doctrines and practices of the early church. Mr. Baldwin

has also invited Mr. Callahan to attend the Henry George Congress at Baltimore on Oct. 12-14. We add our own earnest solicitation for the presence on that occasion of this noted advocate of religious toleration. We assure him many friends will be glad to meet him.

DR. CULLEY, who established the Henry George Foundation of Australia with a gift of \$100,000, was bereaved by the death of his wife in the latter part of 1930. Later Dr. Culley suffered a painful accident, from which he is only now recovering.

THE *Washington Daily News* congratulates the citizens of Chanute, Kan., whose city budget is fully met by the town's municipal gas and electric plants. This is a fine thing for the landlords, but how does it benefit the people of Chanute?

THE *Jewish Morning Journal* (Yiddish) of this city has a two-column article entitled "A Belated Revolution." Its statement of what the Single Tax is for the most part accurate. The writer, William Zuckerman, concludes that "the dream of Henry George is now being realized in England, but it is now too late." Something else is now required, according to the writer, who repeats the curious error that *Progress and Poverty* appeared in an agrarian age and is no longer applicable. Yet what can be more important than a free earth? And how is the proposition for the taking of economic rent lessened in importance by its enormous increase? It would seem that its importance is increased rather than diminished. But the writer is a Socialist.

E. T. WEEKS, of New Iberia, La., sends us samples of a leaflet, "To Employers and Employees," which has been distributed at the doors of churches.

AN old friend of the writer, Louis Kempner, of New York, being strongly moved by James R. Brown's recent radio talk, wrote the latter the following card: "Turned in on your radio talk last night. It was interesting stuff, especially your mind-reading act to the fellow who owned a vacant lot next to the high school. Did you hear me applaud your clever answer?"

WE want to acknowledge our indebtedness to Samuel Danziger, of Baltimore, many of whose strikingly incisive comments on conditions have been used by his permission without credit. Few men are writing today in a better or more convincing vein. The pages of comment sent out by Mr. Danziger at regular intervals for editorial use must be very welcome to overworked editors.

A LETTER from Bolton Hall notable for its clear-cut incisiveness appears in the *New Republic* under the title "From a Hardened Single Taxer." It is a relief to know that some one writes for the *New Republic* who is "hardened" and not merely "mushy."

FRED PEASE is the father of the Single Tax movement in Milk River, Alberta, Canada, where we have quite a number of subscribers. Mr. Pease is an occasional contributor to the Alberta papers. An article of more than a column's length in a provincial newspaper is before us as we write. Long life to this devoted servant of a great cause.

FREDERICK VERINDER, general secretary of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values, writes: "I was glad to be able to get away for a short vacation and am now back preparing for the autumn work of following up the first step Budget and preparing the way for further steps. My kind regards to my New York friends, Balmer, Murphy, Leubuscher, etc."

THE Sunday magazine supplement of the *New York Times* contains an interesting interview with George Foster Peabody, who has just entered his eightieth year. The article is illustrated with an excellent



portrait of Mr. Peabody. He is quoted as saying: "I have discovered that the separation of people by clime or race is man-made. False ideas, economic barriers and a wrong conception of patriotism have gone to make for discord and strife, where harmony and international brotherhood should reign. Oh, if only the people of the world would learn to think!"

WE acknowledge receipt of an eight-page pamphlet by George White, of Long Branch, N. J., in which he reviews the tax system of the State of New Jersey and suggests changes. The author, whose address is 80 Atlantic Avenue, Long Branch, N. J., invites criticism of his statements and arguments.

AMONG the recent Single Taxers to pass away who were long subscribers of LAND AND FREEDOM are S. N. Daugherty, of Seattle, Wash., and W. H. Quinn, of Niagara, Ont.

THE Schalkenbach Foundation, 11 Park Place, New York City, has recently published a neatly printed pamphlet containing the addresses at the funeral of Henry George. These, as many of our readers will remember, were delivered by Rev. Lyman Abbott, Rabbi Gottheil, Dr. McGlynn and John Sherwin Crosby. The pamphlet comprises fifty-five pages bound in stiff covers and is sold for 25 cents postpaid.

*Farm and Dairy*, Peterborough, Ont., is one of the leading farm journals of that province. It advocates the taxation of land values and prints occasional letters from its correspondents in favor of the measure.

P. W. SCHWANDER, of Houston, Tex., who is one of the best paragraphists in the movement, writes: "I read every line of LAND AND FREEDOM and enjoy them, especially the editorials, which I read twice over. They are always excellent."

THE *Boston Transcript* is an organ of the ultra-conservative and it is seldom that letters in advocacy of our movement appear in its columns. Thomas N. Ashton, who is a well-known attorney of Fall River, has entry to its pages, however, owing to his standing and well known reputation in that city. Letters from him appear frequently in the *Transcript*.

A GROUP calling itself "The American Committee," with Lawson Purdy as its chairman, has been formed for the purpose of aiding the United Committee of London in its work of extending a knowledge of the teachings of Henry George among the British people. Other members of the American committee are Charles O'Connor Hennessy, who is treasurer; Byron Holt, Anna George deMille, Frederick C. Leubuscher, Charles R. Eckert, of Beaver, Pa., and A. C. Campbell, of Ottawa.

WILL it come to be said that we shall have to look to the small-town papers rather than to the great dailies of the cities for discussion of fundamental questions in a broad minded way? It would seem so. Here is the *Enterprise*, of Hartselle, Ala., with a leading editorial on trade which the editor says is "swapping" in the last analysis, and another from the same paper on the recent idiotic proposal of the Farm Board, entitled "Destruction of Wealth Not the Road to Riches." It is well that the name of this editor should be named, so hats off to Mr. C. R. Walker.

A RECENT review of a work published by Houghton Mifflin Company on "New Russia's Primer," which is the story of the Five-Year Plan, appears in the *Daily Capitol* of Topeka, Kan., and is from the pen of George Hughes. Mr. Hughes is an old Single Taxer and is, as some of our readers know, the son of the author of "Tom Brown's School Days," which remains even to this day the best school story ever written.

CHARLES E. CLARKE, of Bewdley, England, sending a three years' subscription to LAND AND FREEDOM, writes: "I find your paper most interesting. I should not like to be without it. It deserves a circulation of a million. Best wishes for success in your work."

GEORGE GEIGER, whose remarkable thesis, "The Philosophy of Henry George," with which he won his degree as doctor of philosophy, has returned from England, where he had the pleasure of meeting the leaders of the movement. He also visited Ireland and met Father Dawson, old friend of Henry George, who commended his work and sent him on his way with his blessing. A. W. Madsen, in a recent letter writes: "We were delighted to meet Professor Geiger and had a most interesting conversation with him. He is the kind of man one looks forward to meeting again. I expect him back in the office in a day or two. Then he goes to Scotland to see the country that "belongs to both Mr. Paul and myself."

OUR indefatigable friend Morris Van Veen holds two or three open-air meetings every week during the summer months. In this work he is helped by George Lloyd and two younger Single Taxers, Willie Smackey and Max Berkowitz. The latter is an under teacher of French and is a most enthusiastic advocate. He is not troubled with pessimistic doubts about the ultimate triumph of the movement, and his splendid spirit is contagious.

JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE left for the East to join Mr. McNair in Boston and stopped along the way at South Bend and Elkhart, Ind., Grand Rapids and Detroit, Mich., and Buffalo and Troy, N. Y.

HENRY GEORGE CLUBS are being organized in South Bend, Ind., and Grand Rapids and Detroit, Mich. Dr. E. G. Freyeremuth, 203 Varier Building, South Bend, is taking the lead in forming an active organization in his city. Herman M. Friedrich, 701 Livingston St., Grand Rapids, and J. S. Tindall, of Cedar Springs, are cooperating with local Single Taxers in organizing the Henry George Club of Grand Rapids. F. T. Merrick, formerly a business associate of F. F. Ingram, now director of the Detroit Secretarial Service, Penobscot Building, is bringing a group together in Detroit. . . . Ray Robson, of Lansing, Mich., whose speaking in central Michigan has been effective during the past year, believes that an active club may be possible in his city before long. . . . Herbert A. Graham, director of Ashland College, Grant, Mich., would like to see a strong State-wide Henry George movement in Michigan. Toward that end he will be glad to have Single Tax leaders throughout the State confer together at his college, which is some twenty miles northwest of Grand Rapids. . . . Henry George Clubs are now being organized in New England, following the lecture campaign of the Henry George Lecture Association, in which William N. McNair, John S. Codman and John Lawrence Monroe spoke before leading clubs and special meetings, pointing to the taxation of land values and the untaxing of labor and industry as the rational solution to the unemployed question and recurring business depressions. . . . This movement for the organizing of local clubs in every city where volunteer organizers are to be found is a part of the united action program outlined by the Henry George Foundation of America and the Henry George Association. Enrollment cards, especially printed for the purpose, with the photograph of Henry George and a statement of purpose, are furnished free of charge to local organizers wishing them. An assortment of literature is made available to the local clubs at cost, each piece of literature being printed with the name, address and telephone number of the organizer and the name of the local club. While each new club becomes automatically affiliated with the national body, it is entirely free to carry out its own program as the local situation dictates. The financing of the local clubs and their activities is separate from that of the national organization, although the national headquarters offers every possible cooperation to the local groups. . . . Following are a few of the September



and October lecture dates to be filled by William McNair: New York City, Manhattan Single Tax Club, Monday, Sept. 28, P. M.; Hoboken, N. J., Rotary Club, Tuesday, Sept. 29, noon; Trenton, N. J., Kiwanis Club, Wednesday, Sept. 30, noon; East Hampton, N. Y., Business men's Club, Wednesday, Sept., 30, P. M.; Newark, N. J., Kiwanis Club, Thursday, Oct. 1, noon; Passaic, N. J., Lions Club, Friday, Oct. 2, P. M.; Staten Island, N. Y., Chamber of Commerce, Monday, Oct. 5, noon; Oswego, N. Y., Rotary Club, Tuesday, Oct. 6, noon; Corning, N. Y., Chamber of Commerce, Tuesday, Oct. 6, P. M.; Rome, N. Y., Kiwanis Club, Wednesday, Oct. 7, noon; East Aurora, N. Y., Kiwanis Club, Thursday, Oct. 8, noon; Syracuse, N. Y., Rotary Club, Friday, Oct. 9, noon; Buffalo, N. Y., Single Tax Dinner (tentative), Saturday, Oct. 10, P. M.; Rochester, N. Y., Y. M. & W. H. A., Sunday, Oct. 11, P. M.

GEORGE M. STRACHAN, vice president of the Chicago Single Tax Club, recently entertained three young Russian engineers for three days. They were much interested in Mr. Strachan's presentation of the Single Tax, but did not commit themselves, saying that "they were in the employ of the Soviet Government." But Mr. Strachan has made other converts recently, among who are Richard Howe, in charge of the pavilion at Humboldt Park; Arnold A. Witzman, formerly of Los Angeles, and William Lilly, electrical engineer for the City of Chicago.

JOHN C. ROSE, of Pittsburgh, Pa., has started a letter writing staff of the newly organized Henry George Press Bureau. Mr. Rose, in conjunction with Claude L. Watson, will conduct the press bureau. Mr. Watson has been a Single Taxer since he was sixteen years old. He lived at Webb City, Mo., at that time, his interest in the subject being first aroused by Dr. L. C. Chenoweth, now more than eighty years of age and living at Joplin, Mo. Messrs. Rose and Watson, as directors of the letter writing staff, will appreciate the names of those willing to serve as members of the staff. We suggest that they get in touch with C. H. Ingersoll. . . . Mr. Ingersoll, whose address is 347 Park Avenue, Orange, N. J., has launched his Letter-a-Week Club. He believes the work will quickly and easily lead to general press bureau activity. Our friend desires the following from all Single Taxers: (1) Join the club and say you will write one or more letters a week from copy to be furnished, or your own. (2) Watch for publication and send clippings. (3) Send a list of papers in your section with information regarding each, experience with them, clippings, editorial pages, etc. . . . Mr. Ingersoll says "there is much effective organization of letter writing already, and some of it of astonishing proportions and showing skillful handling, involving intimate knowledge of the attitude of editors, how to present material, etc. We Single Taxers as a whole have no idea of the extent of this work being done quietly by such untiring workers as Colgate, of Rome, Ga.; Noren and Rose, of Pittsburgh; Beecher, of Warren, Pa.; Black, of Texas; Danziger, of Baltimore; Graham, of New York, et al."

RECENT Single Tax speakers over WCFL, radio station of the Chicago Federation of Labor, have included George C. Olcott, George T. Tideman, Henry H. Hardinge, Emil O. Jorgensen, John Lawrence Monroe, Henry L. T. Tideman and Edward P. E. Troy, of San Francisco. The ten-minute broadcasts are arranged by Mr. George M. Strachan through the courtesy of the Federation of Labor. They go on the air at 7:45 every Tuesday evening. A new feature of the broadcasts soon to be introduced is the awarding of copies of Progress and Poverty to listeners for the best letters on the Single Tax.

THROUGH the movement in England, and through the city's hunting for new sources of revenue, the Single Tax has been a live subject of discussion in St. Louis particularly in the columns of the *Post-Dispatch*, so much so, in fact, that at least two full pages were given to it in the

course of two weeks alone. Mr. Harland Eugene Read, of St. Louis, had a splendid article on the British land-tax situation, and gave much history of the successful application of land-value taxation.

DEXTER AND LAURA BUELL are pupils at the Organic School at Fairhope, Ala., Laura, sixteen, and Dexter, eighteen, are children of the late C. J. Buell, who was noted during his lifetime for his work for the Single Tax. His Legislative Year Book, in the compilation of which he was aided by Hon. S. A. Stockwell, was a valuable aid to good government, and the Minnesota mining royalty tax was largely his work. It is hoped that in the future these young people may be inspired by the memory of their great father to further the movement with the same high-hearted devotion.

THE Henry George Lecture Association of Chicago has been active in arranging lecture dates for William N. McNair, of Pittsburgh. Nine lectures were delivered in June and eighteen in September and October. Among his lectures is one on "Philip Snowden and the new British Budget." Mr. McNair's previous tours of Pennsylvania, when he talked straight Single Tax, won him more than a million votes for United States Senator in 1928.

THE Taxpayers' Defense League, of Seattle, Wash., proposes an initiative measure exempting \$3,000 in actual value of all improvements made upon the land. Its secretary is A. A. Booth, an active Single Taxer and attorney of Seattle. Active also in this organization work is C. Arlin Nave, of the same city.

THE chairman of the Taxation Committee of the Seattle Municipal League is George D. Linn, a Single Taxer formerly of Spokane and now of Seattle, Wash., Although the majority report of the Committee for 1931 was not in harmony with Single Tax principles, three members of the committee joined Mr. Linn in a minority report largely embracing these principles. They recommended that all personal property and improvements on land be exempt from taxation.

T. K. HEDRICK, until recently an editor of the *Chicago Daily News*, is contemplating the publication of a newspaper in Chicago that will have Single Tax as an important part of its editorial policy. Mr. Hedrick was largely responsible for William Marion Reedy becoming a Single Taxer.

RECENT Single Tax visitors to Chicago were Mrs. James J. (Charlotte Smith) Sayer, of Portland, Ore., and her little grandchild, Mary Louise, who stopped on their way from Cleveland to meet a few Chicago Single Taxers, John Z. White among them. Mrs. Sayer was active in the movement in Cleveland until a few years ago.

THE Rev. J. Vint Laughlin and James Bruce Lindsay, of Rochester, N. Y., gave twelve Sunday radio broadcasts during the months of May and June, talking straight Single Tax.

FRENCH tax experts have recently discovered that the citizens were evading the tax on matches and automatic lighters by the aid of gas jets, with which cafes are abundantly supplied. It is pointed out that one cannot give another a light from his own cigarette without a license, if this tax provision is to be rigidly carried out. Thus one kind of tax is reduced to an absurdity.

THE *Presbyterian Advance* (Labor Day edition), which is published in Nashville, Tenn., reprints "The City That Hath Foundations," by Lewis H. Clark, of Sodus, which poem, in blank verse, is included among the pamphlets advertised on the back page cover of this issue.