

January—February, 1940

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

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

The College of Tomorrow

J. H. McMix

The Economy of Spain

Rogelio Casas Cadilla

Henry George, Employer

Louise Crane

Experience and the Future

Hon. Jackson H. Ralston

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

# LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Founded by Joseph Dana Miller

Published by

LAND AND FREEDOM, 150 Nassau Street, New York

EDITORS:

CHARLES JOS. SMITH      JOS. HIRAM NEWMAN

ROBERT CLANCY

Please address all communications to LAND AND FREEDOM

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.

## JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1940

VOL. XL

NO. 1 WHOLE NO. 218

### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

NEW ZEALAND: { Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.  
T. E. McMillan, Matamata.

SPAIN: A. Matheu Alonso, Tarragona.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

HUNGARY: J. J. Pikler, Budapest.

FRANCE: Jng. Pavlos Giannelia.

### INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	3
"PLEASE, SON—CARRY ON".....	4
THE ECONOMY OF SPAIN.....Rogelio Casas Cadilla	4
HENRY GEORGE, EMPLOYER.....Louise Crane	6
FREE TRADE—PRO AND CON.....	8
HOUSE TO HOUSE, FIELD TO FIELD.....Stephen Bell	9
CAUSERIE.....Thomas N. Ashton	11
EXPERIENCE AND THE FUTURE...Hon. Jackson H. Ralston	13
THE SHARECROPPERS.....Grace Isabel Colbron	15
THE COLLEGE OF TOMORROW.....J. H. McMix	16
PRIVATE ENTERPRISE.....Louis Wallis	18
BUMMER AND LAZARUS.....Jos. W. Foley	21
SIGNS OF PROGRESS.....	23
AN APPEAL FOR ACTION.....Henry J. Foley	27
SINGLE TAX—A MISNOMER.....George C. Winne	28
BOOK REVIEWS.....	28
CORRESPONDENCE.....	29
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	31

## 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.

Please Make Subscriptions and Checks Payable to LAND AND FREEDOM

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XL

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1940

No. 1

## Comment and Reflection

THE struggle for liberty is long and slow. But it is worth while. "Only in broken gleams and partial light has the sun of Liberty yet beamed among men." We have never enjoyed the full warmth and light of that sun. Not yet has it permeated every corner of our lives. The soul of man still yearns to freely express itself. But let us not depreciate the few gleams that come through. We know they trace their origin to the great, beautiful sun of Liberty. And it must be remembered that those gleams were won with great sacrifice.

IN the midst of tyranny and oppression, and a defiling of the rights of man, the voice of Liberty continues to whisper, "*These others have a right to live, too.*" A hero hearkens, and to the call he dedicates his life. With what agony and blood a few concessions are won is too well known. And with what ease they can be lost again need not be cited. The recent experiences of Spain, China, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Finland have shocked us. We imagined that Ormuzd had triumphed. We underestimated the strength of the powers of darkness. But we must not deceive ourselves. Ahriman *does* win victories, and there are times when Ormuzd, wounded, is compelled to retreat.

THEREFORE, let us not slip into a complacent inertia, satisfied with the few rays that have been won. Let us rather take them as a weapon to continue the struggle. Let us use them to beat back the dark clouds of injustice, so that the full light of Liberty may shine forth! The few gleams that come are a challenge to us. That they are shining at all, means that so much of the dark forces have been dispersed! Knowledge does not come to us all at once. We must constantly struggle for it and keep on winning it. So it may be that our understanding of Liberty has to come slowly. Perhaps it is not something that springs full-armed and perfected like Pallas from the head of Zeus. Rather, it has humble beginnings and grows only with the growth of intelligence, tolerance, and love.

WHEN the English barons forced King John to sign the Magna Charta, that was certainly not the consummation of Liberty. Was it not class interest that prompted them to curb the Plantagenet? Yet, in spite of themselves, they advanced the cause of Liberty. It was a step forward, in that it restored some rights to a group of people who had somehow lost them in the course of history. It was a great achievement for that period.

GEORGE WASHINGTON was essentially aristocratic, as were many of the early statesmen and leaders of our country. At that time the step toward freedom and democracy may have had to be taken in a cautious way. Perhaps a sudden, violent advance causes us to slip and fall rather than make progress. The Russian Revolution is a case in point. We know too that the work of Liberty was not fully accomplished with the work of Abraham Lincoln. But who can deny that his name belongs among those of the heroes of Liberty? Did he not have a vision of equal rights, and did he not strive for a restoration of rights to a greater group of people than before? Universal suffrage did not sweep away all the clouds. But did not another gleam come through?

THE steps toward Liberty in the past have meant the attainment of certain rights for special groups of people. The progress of Liberty has been in the broadening of these attainments to larger and larger groups. True Liberty will be achieved only with the realization of the universal brotherhood of mankind. True Liberty can stop at nothing less. For what is Liberty but the recognition of the rights of *all* the sons of men? Are we ready for such liberty? Would we recognize it if it came thus, full-grown? We wonder. After all, Liberty comes to us only as we are able to comprehend it.

THUS far, we have only appreciated the reflections of the sun of Liberty rather than the sun itself. The toilers for Liberty in the past have striven mostly for political and intellectual freedom. But, slowly, mankind is beginning to realize that economic freedom is the basic form of Liberty. Political, yes, even intellectual

freedom, may be said to derive from economic freedom. But the work of those who toiled for Liberty has not been in vain. The rays of the sun do not penetrate an overcast sky. The clearer and purer the atmosphere, the more radiant is the solar glow. Our forebears in the struggle for Liberty have helped to clear that atmosphere. We, who toil for economic freedom, will find our work easier because of what they did.

## "Please, Son—Carry On!"

**T**HE following letter was written by Joseph Dana Miller, in 1934, to a student of the Henry George School of Social Science. Mr. Miller had an abiding faith in Oscar H. Geiger's vision—to spread the truths of political economy and real democracy by educational methods.—Ed.

"Dear —:—

"This is indeed a personal letter.

"This is an appeal from a man who has devoted a half century to the propagation of a religious conviction, to one who has recently acquired a knowledge of this philosophy, and to whom the old man cries out:

"Please, son—carry on!"

"You do not know me, perhaps. I am Joseph Dana Miller, the Editor, for over thirty years, of LAND AND FREEDOM, official organ of the Single Tax Movement in America. During these years I have recorded in the pages of this bi-monthly the activities, ideas, hopes of thousands of men and women who have poured out their life's blood at the altar of economic liberty.

"In all these years no single effort to advance the movement, to increase the number of those familiar with the philosophy, has been nearly as successful as the class method developed by the Henry George School of Social Science. In only two years thousands\* of thoroughly-informed converts have been added to the movement, and plans afoot indicate that within less than a decade at least one hundred thousand followers of Henry George will be recorded.

"My one wish is that my life shall be spared until I see that achievement, for from the dynamic force of so many devotees, the political enactment of at least part of our philosophy will be more than a possibility.

"But, even if I am not here, I hope there is some provision in the scheme of things beyond that will permit me to look on while you and others like you carry on the work, to bless you, and to comfort my soul with the thought that the years I carried the torch were not in vain.

"You will, I am sure, carry on.

"Yours sincerely,

"Joseph Dana Miller."

\* Today, the number of graduates and students is around 13,200, according to a recent report of the Henry George School of Social Science.

## The Economy of Spain

By ROGELIO CASAS CADILLA

**I**N the fourteenth century, Spain was a free and prosperous country. The arts were cultivated, the profession of letters was protected and many industries such as textiles, steel of Toledo, silks, spices and carpets, were very flourishing. From all countries people came to buy and sell their products. Freedom of thought was respected in all its purity. No one was persecuted for his ideas. Mohammedans had their mosques, Jews their synagogues and Catholics built their cathedrals. The most famous cathedrals of present-day Spain were constructed in that epoch.

The dignity of man and the sacred respect for individual rights had always been the glory and honor of the Spanish people. The citizenship which evolves from individual liberty was a quality of the Spaniard of those glorious times. Kings were treated familiarly and they were denied the right to reign if they lacked the support of moral law. This was the indomitable race of the "Fuero Juzgo"; the Court of Leon was convoked seventy years before the English established their parliament in London in the twelfth century, in the Court of Borja, the predominance of the community or peasantry was recognized and from the time of Alfonso the Third the right and duty of insurrection was proclaimed. In Aragon the mar called "Judge" became superior to the man called "King." The fearful "yes" or "no" of the Justice was upheld before the throne. It was a people who, at birth held Charlemagne in check, and at death repulsed Napoleon.

The intrigues of religion brought into power the daughter of King Henry of Trastramara and the famous battle of Toro gave the power to that lady who, meanwhile, had married Fernando of Aragon. This marriage brought about what is known as "National Unity"—the beginning of the downfall of the Spanish people. The attempt to dominate the whole Peninsula involved them in a struggle over the region in the hands of the Arabs. After sixteen years of bloody warfare the Catholic monarchs emerged victorious. At the end of the war, which was really one of extermination, Queen Isabella granted honors and titles to all who had aided her economically and gave them dominion over the towns and lands. The common people who had been happy with their "ejidos" or public system of land ownership, were gradually impoverished. Under their public or municipal system of land ownership they aged were provided for; there was no need to impose taxes upon consumption and there were ample funds for public education. However, when the newly created nobles deprived them of their lands and properties, they lost everything.

Queen Isabella realized the great error she had made in paying for services rendered with lands and properties that were not hers, and she requested, in several royal

decrees, that the lands and resources be returned to the cities, but she was never obeyed. At her death, in her famous testament, she again requested that the lands be returned to the people, but the newly rich, the famous Spanish nobility that she had founded, were immovable. They not only disobeyed Isabella's request, but they demanded more lands, saying that they had been paid very little for their services and they should be given the Province of Castile, in addition to Andalusia and the parts of Estremadura which had already been granted them. Cisneros, tutor of Charles the Fifth and a man of great talent and dignity, opposed the demands of the nobles but the fatuous Charles the Fifth gave himself over to them wholly, and, with the aid of his German invaders, destroyed the Communities of Castile and beheaded the leaders who defended the sacred right of every man to the products of his labor.

Charles the Fifth was the worst king Spain ever had. He launched wars of conquest, established a dictatorship in Spain, created the commercial monopoly of the trade with the Indies and destroyed with cannon-balls the free cities of Italy where the Renaissance and The Modern Age had their beginnings. He ended the free trade between cities and liberty of thought disappeared. Under his son, Phillip the Second, the economic situation grew worse from day to day. Hatred towards the liberty of man increased. During the reign of Charles the Second, who was known as "The Bewitched" and was the last ruler of the fatal house of Austria, prayers were screamed in the streets, so desperate had become the condition of the people. A nation of thirty-two millions of inhabitants was reduced to seven millions. The industries of silks, mosaics and knitted goods, etc., had disappeared. Roads went to ruin because of lack of traffic. Communication became impossible. The best careers open to a man were to enter the church or become a highwayman. The Church swayed the kings to its will, and when the state had even million ducats of income, the Church had thirteen millions. It is impossible, in a few words, to explain how work was carried on in this epoch. A directed economy dictated by unions and guilds had reached unbelievable limits. For example, a sardine fisherman could not fish for any other kind of fish because the authorities would not allow him to sell it later. The carpenter of oak could not work in pine wood.

The people of Spain had entered into a hell of their own making. They are still in it, and to come out of it will cost much sacrifice and effort.

With liberty in Spain the country could be a cauldron of industry where now one finds only misery. The Americas would again turn to Spain by the mere attraction of its enlightenment and prosperity. Liberty is the magnet of progressive association. Liberty and the return of the land to its rightful owners, the people, would bring to Spain:

Production without tariffs, consumption without taxes, communication without blockage, industry without proletariat, riches without parasites, speech without gag, law without deceit, strength without armies, fraternity without class consciousness, work for all, and harness for none.

It would be the *ideal* become the actual, and as there exists the guide swallow, there could exist the guide nation.

A Spain of equal citizens sharing equal rights in the land, would be a vigorous Spain. A democratic Spain would be a fortress Spain, a supreme, inexorable reality.

Liberty is immutable. It is always tranquil because it is indivisible, and invincible because it is contagious. He who attacks it, acquires it—is absorbed by it. The army that is sent against it rebounds against the despot.

A Spain with liberty and without private property in land would be an irradiation of the true, a promise for all. Totalitarian Spain awaits the spirit of Henry George.

## One of Rent's Masks

By LAURIE J. QUINBY

**D**URING the days when land values were booming, I remarked to a merchant that as land rent advanced wages and interest declined. This he disputed, saying, "You will agree that in this location land values have at least quadrupled in the past ten years, while our payroll and interest (dividends) have enormously increased."

"I agree to your former statement," I replied, "but doubt the latter part of it. Do you keep a cost-finding system?"

"Yes," said he, "and I can show you."

"But wait a minute," I asked: "You own this building *and the site* on which it stands. Do you charge against merchandising business a rental, and if so, how often do you revise it?"

He replied, "Yes, we do charge a rental against the merchandising business, but, coming to think of it, we have not revised it during the past ten years. We are still charging the same rental as then."

"Well, then," I suggested, "would you mind looking over your cost system as to your relative payroll and earnings then and now, in comparison with what is a fair rental now?" He assented.

Several days later I called. As I approached, he smiled. "I am having fun with my partners," said he. "I am proving to them that we are losing money."

"So," I rejoined, "you found that you are profiting not as merchants but as landlords?"

"That's about it," he admitted. "And I wonder how many other merchants who own their properties are overlooking that fact."

## Henry George, Employer\*

By LOUISE CRANE

WE have become familiar with the figure of the great leader of men, the friend of humanity, the noble, patient well-wisher of mankind—Henry George. He has been pictured to us as the philosopher, the economist, the teacher and friend, the husband and father. But would we not like to know something of him as the employer of labor? Was he a kind master, humane and fair? Or was there, after all, a marked difference between what he preached and what he practiced, as is too often the case with some self-styled "friends of the working-man?" Engrossed with the subject in the abstract, they reject as trivial the suggestion that charity ought to begin at home.

I bethought me of a friend who was once a member of the staff of *The Standard*, militant journal founded by Henry George. William T. Croasdale, the editor, had a "right-hand man," who was a woman. This woman is the friend I speak of. I took paper and pencil, consulted her, and brought away the following:

"How we loved Mr. George! How we valued his approbation, and how little we ever thought of deceiving him, or of imposing on his generous, patient spirit! I count among the happiest hours of my life those I spent over the routine connected with the presentation to the public of the Single Tax doctrine.

"Our offices were quite the reverse of sumptuous. They were on the second story of a somewhat dilapidated building on Union Square, reached by climbing, at your own risk, a flight of rickety and none too clean stairs. The offices were cleaned every morning by a large, fat, office boy, and this was his system: After removing the top layers of newspapers, with which the floor was always littered, John would appear with an enormous, green, sprinkling can, which he would ply with a fearless, impartial hand. If you sat down at your desk before John had finished 'cleanin' up' you shared a like fate with the office furniture and the parlor stove (which kept us warm). John was a well-meaning, hard-working boy, but his duties were multitudinous and varied and he could not always arrange them in regular order.

"When everything was in a drip, he would fetch a muddy broom, and with it push the floor clear. The papers dragged dirt along with them, but the broom left muddy traces to relieve the monotony and altogether it was a most unusual-looking place after John got through. So much for the sanctum sanctorum, which consisted of two rooms, one of which was what is known as a hall bedroom. What they did about the cleaning in the

business office (the room in the rear) I never did know and I never voiced a suspicion I had that the subscription clerk got down on his knees and scrubbed the floor after we had all gone home. It was just that much cleaner in that room.

"But we were all so happy there! Mr. George would favor us with a visit every now and then. He took no part in the office work, being busy with his books. Once in a while he would ask one of us to come to his house and help him, and how gladly we would go! Always good-tempered, he never misjudged anyone; he never spoke sharply, or unkindly. The sweetness of his disposition, and his affectionate nature made him a delightful master, who held us to our duties out of respect for the man.

"A man of indefatigable energy himself, he never had an idle moment. He was said to have been intolerant of drones but I have more than once observed that it took him a long time to notice remissness in an employee. I remember a case in point. We had taken in an extra office-boy temporarily, who, as is quite common, worked while you were watching him, and dawdled the rest of the time. One day Mr. George came in and seeing the extra boy, began to question him. The boy became very much confused because he feared he had been detected, but Mr. George kept on, like a man gathering statistics, too much engrossed for a time to observe the boy's embarrassment. When he did finally notice it he left the room and the building abruptly without another word. Not long after Mr. George said to his son, Richard, then our bookkeeper, 'Would you say Dick, that that boy is a faithful worker?' 'No, father,' was the reply, 'but he is only here temporarily.' 'Humph,' was all Mr. George said. But we urged Richard to discharge the boy.

"Whenever Mr. George came to the office he asked the why and the wherefore of everything that was going on, but he always had a preoccupied air, which often deceived us into thinking he was not listening. And then some day long after he would surprise us by referring to some trivial thing which we would have thought safe to say he had passed over. It was his habit of asking questions that led newcomers to the office to believe him a very exacting, suspicious and distrustful employer, who wasn't going to allow himself to be bamboozled if he could help it. But they didn't think that way very long.

"It was immediately on his return from a lecture trip in Australia that I first met Mr. George. He wore a cheap suit of light brown clothes that hung loosely on him, and a square-top brown derby hat pushed far back on his head. By the way, I think I never saw Mr. George in anything but a Prince Albert coat. Turning to greet me he gave me a hearty handclasp and a genial, kindly encouraging smile, saying, 'Why, Croasdale, she's a mere child!' 'Is she?' answered Croasdale, 'ask the child

\*This interesting document was originally published as a newspaper article twenty-five years ago.—ED.

what she knows about the Single Tax.' 'The Single Tax as we call it, for want of a better name,' I began, without waiting for Mr. George to speak, and mimicking the words and gestures of one of our best-known speakers of whom I knew Mr. George to be very fond, 'the Single Tax contemplates the abolition of all taxes save one on the value of land, irrespective of improvements.' Long and loud rang out that hearty laugh which was one of the most charming things about him. And whenever he felt like 'having a good laugh' he would make me repeat that little 'lesson in first principles.'

"To Mr. George labor was sacred. The humblest worker had a dignity in his eyes and a casual observer might have found it difficult to determine which was employer and which employed, judging by their manner of addressing each other. Mr. George respected his office boy, but the office boy adored him.

"I once reported a club banquet given in Mr. George's honor at which I was the only woman present. He insisted on having me placed at his right, while at his left sat the president of the club. Mr. George sat with his back to a window, and once, between speeches, I remarked that I felt very warm. He called to someone to open the window and it was done very quietly so that the man opposite me didn't notice it for a time. But, always alert for the well-being of the great philosopher, he soon spied the open window. In a jiffy he had jumped up, closed the window, and, looking from Mr. George to me in such a way as to make me feel very guilty, he seemed to be making a mental comparison between us and decided against me. Mr. George laughed, shrugged his shoulders, and said. 'No use, Miss——!' And I answered, 'No use.' And that was all. And yet that man under almost any other conceivable circumstance would have accused himself of great rudeness if he had acted similarly. This shows that it was not only respect and admiration for the man that held all he met to him—it was love. In many cases, like this, one might almost say it was a protecting love, for he was ever careless of himself, ever underestimating his usefulness.

"Let me tell you something to prove what I said about Mr. George's wonderful temper. One day Mr. Croasdale sent word to Mr. Louis F. Post that he must have a certain lengthy article by the next Wednesday (I think it was). Mr. Post promised to send it by messenger boy on Tuesday. The article hadn't arrived on Wednesday morning, as Mr. Post had promised. Mr. Croasdale was a man of irascible temper, so he immediately began, violently: 'Why the devil, Post, don't you do as you say? You know I ought to have had that thing——!' 'What's the matter?' asked Post, invariably amiable. 'I sent the article, if that is the cause of your wrath, by messenger yesterday afternoon.' 'What——' dropped blank from Mr. Croasdale's lips. The two stared at each other and the same thought entered each one's mind. The boy must

have lost the manuscript! In an instant Croasdale's face flushed purple and then he uncorked the vials of his wrath, and the familiar pop fell on my ear, as I stood in the next room. I knew he would call me in and tell it to me in his own picturesque, diverting way, which you couldn't publish if I described it, and in another moment the summons came. As I stood listening sympathetically to the irate editor the door opened and a little mite of a boy with tear-stained face appeared. Instinctively, Croasdale knew it must be the boy. And what a terrible ten seconds for the poor child, before the door opened once more, this time to admit the dignified figure of Henry George, the champion of the weak. Then, of course, it had to be told all over again, but Mr. George didn't sympathize with his editor a bit. He was divided between his desire to laugh at Croasdale and the sympathy that welled up in his tender heart at the sight of the wretched object of so much splutter. He looked over at Mr. Post, who had seated himself at Mr. Croasdale's desk, and the latter's eyes followed his, 'That's right, Post, write a complaint. Have the miserable whelp——' 'Complaint,' answered the imperturbable Post, with a chuckle, 'I'm rewriting the article.' I wish I could do justice to the state of Mr. Croasdale's feathers at this announcement. They seemed to expand, puffed out with an ungovernable rage, and yet he was abashed, although disgusted, with this forgiving, what's-the-use-of-getting-excited spirit. He did not know what to do or say, so he turned his attention once more to the boy. But Mr. George said, quietly: 'Now, that will do, Croasdale. The child has explained the accident'—(at this word the editor bridled)—'and we will let him go.' The boy looked up gratefully at Mr. George, who put one hand on his shoulder and with the other offered him a coin, and pushed the sobbing wretch out of the room. To me this was always the most remarkable thing I ever encountered, because the man who had really suffered the abuse and who would be put to the inconvenience of doing his work all over again sat quietly, taking no part whatever in the 'trouble'. And Mr. George was pained, as was to be expected, at the injustice. It was plain that he felt the poor child ought not to have had such harsh treatment.

"I was about to say that I never heard from anyone in or around that office, any word about Mr. George that was not a tribute to some one of his many noble personal qualities, but on second thought I shall have to qualify that just a trifle. The compositors used to swear, not at him, I am sure, but certainly at his manuscript. It used to be common talk that Mr. George never sent back a proof without the margins filled with his closely written script. They made a test, so they said, at one time, and by an herculean effort turned out a proof that was typographically perfect, yet it came back with filled margins, like any other. 'On second thought,' he would

mutter, 'perhaps this would be better.' And then scratch, scratch, scratch. One day they threatened to cut the margins off, top, bottom and sides, but an inconsiderate foreman interfered.

But these little things were all on the surface. They might swear, but they loved him, as we all did. 'It is a way compositors have.'

"And so we lived our lives in the effort to please him, made happy by his presence, and going home at night sustained by the hope of seeing him on the morrow, disappointed if he didn't come, and doubly glad when he appeared after an absence of a few days. Nobody loved him more than we did. To us no better man ever lived, and I, for one, never expect to meet another as good, as sincerely and truly noble as Henry George."

## Free Trade—Pro and Con

PRO

By J. RUPERT MASON

THE most immediate opportunity facing us, it seems to me, is to fairly scream to every one within hearing to urge his Senators and Congressmen to support the reciprocal trade treaty efforts of this Administration. The opponents are sure to be ferocious!

Now that the President has appealed for authority to provide greater freedom of trade between nations, let us not fail to give the suggestion support in every way at the disposal of any of us.

No one realized more completely than Henry George that taxation of land values, alone, would not eliminate unjust privileges, and that the abolition of trade barriers between nations constituted just as integral and essential a step before justice can prevail.

Many Georgeists appear to have all but forgotten this, for they have all but limited their thinking to the importance of government collecting all of the publicly created rental value of land, instead of only part of it, as at present.

Henry George, who launched the Georgeist movement, was of a much broader turn of mind than are his followers. No one can deny that he saw the necessity of collecting all the rent of land. But he also saw the question of Freedom in its larger aspects. In an editorial in *The Standard*, signed by him (reprinted by C. Le Baron Goeller), we find the following:

"As for those of our friends who think we ought to leave protection undisturbed until we have succeeded in taking land values for public benefit, and those who express the same underlying thought by asking why free land will not lead to free trade much more naturally than free trade will lead to free land, it seems to me that they can hardly fully realize the great object which is to be attained

by the Single Tax, nor yet the practical means by which the adoption of this Single Tax is to be secured. Like those who oppose us, or fail to go with us from sheer inability to see how the taxation of land values can abolish poverty, their mental gaze seems to be concentrated on what we propose to do, ignoring what we propose to do away with. The great benefit of the appropriation of land values (i.e., economic rent) to public use would not be in the revenue that it would give, so much as in the abolition of restrictions upon the free play of productive forces it would involve or permit. It is not by the mere levying of a tax that we propose to abolish poverty; it is by 'securing the blessings of liberty.'

"The abolition of all taxes that restrain production or hamper exchange, the doing away with all monopolies and special privileges that enable one citizen to levy toll upon the industries of other citizens, is an integral part of our program. To *merely* take land values in taxation for public purposes would *not of itself* suffice. If the proceeds were spent in maintaining useless parasites or standing armies, labor might still be oppressed and harried by taxes and special privileges. We might still have poverty, and people might still beg for alms or die of starvation. What we are really aiming at is . . . 'the freedom of the individual to use his labor and capital in any way that may seem proper to him and will not interfere with the equal rights of others' and 'to leave to the producer the full fruits of his exertion.' To do this it is necessary to abolish land monopoly. And it is *also necessary to abolish tariffs.*"

By enlisting aggressively with this Administration with regard to its present attempts to lessen trade barriers, the Administration leaders *might* discover that there is much about which we both think alike.

We know that any lowering of tariff barriers must increase the difficulty of private interests continuing to pocket for themselves as much of the publicly created rental value of land as at present. Very few land speculators have caught this, so they may not be as vicious in their opposition to Secretary Hull's aims, as they are to any taxation of land values.

This seems to me to be the most concrete opportunity facing us in many years. I hope it may be soberly considered by every lover of liberty.

CON

By PETER D. HALEY

All the free trade in the world is not going to make better the lot of the German masses. Prior to the World War the German people were faring better than the people of England despite the fact of England's democracy, because landlordism was a little less intense in Germany than in England. The mass of people in tariff-protected



England today are faring as well as they did under the free trade regime of some years back.

Free trade can only intensify the suffering of the producing masses, since trade is the food which feeds the maw of rent collectors. There will be more nearly a parity of opportunity to all in a county where there is little trade. Trade breeds rent and rent is the vampire which sucks the producing masses to emaciation. Bright and Cobden soon came to realize that the benefits they expected from free trade did not materialize, that the rent collector absorbed it all and more.

Man's prosperity or well-being is determined by his relation to the land. All the tariffs in the world cannot have any influence on this. Free trade cannot affect it. There is no need of all this stupidity about free trade, trade barriers and other hokum. Man's well-being is governed by the terms on which he contacts land. There is no other formula. Free trade would be a virtue in a free society—a competitive economy. It is positively harmful to the producing masses in our land monopoly society, our sweepstakes economy.

The farmers of the South and the West have been free to engage in tariff-protected commodities. There is no law against farmers processing. All the farmers need to is to meet the terms of land monopoly. Tariffs apply alike to all the ports and to every inch of our millions of square miles of free trade area. This cry of the North and East having robbed the South and the West is the sheerest bunk. The South and the West have men who have fared as well as any in the East. Too, we have our millions in poverty and distress just the same as is found under the shadows of the tariff-protected factories of the East. These lines—North, South, East and West—mean nothing in economics. If Texas would open opportunity to the masses to contact the land on equal terms, it would soon be seen that the masses would be faring well.

Tariffs have nothing to do with our relation to the land, and that ridiculous idea should be liquidated at the earliest moment. Free traders, free silverites and free spenders of the Doc Townsend variety are of the same breed and we should weed them out. The evils society has suffered through ages have come largely from stupidity and not rascality. We are confronted with one crackpot scheme after another. Free silver has been put to sleep but men in high places trot out another will-o'-the-wisp to take its place.

Why cannot man exercise his brain and examine the fundamentals? Why does he have to go from one hokum to another? Land is the source of subsistence. Exchange of labor is the great facilitating factor in production. The terms of bargain are governed by the terms of contacting land for production. Taxation is the instrument to set the terms of contact in a free society.

## House to House, Field to Field

By STEPHEN BELL

*And he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry.*

*Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth.*

*In mine ears, said the Lord, Of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair, without inhabitant. . . .*

*Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because they have no knowledge; and their honorable men are famished, and their multitude dried up with thirst.*

—ISAIAH.

ALL the wars of conquest waged in recent years, and all previous wars of conquest, have been the natural result of permitting the laying of field to field till there be no place for growing populations, and then trying to create employment by holding domestic markets against "foreigners," by which the economic life of all nations is choked in greater or lesser degree. Nations deficient in natural resources, though failing to adequately develop the resources they have, see supplies and markets abroad which they need, but see no way of acquiring them except by the might of their arms, though each and every one of them has it within its own power to remove half or more of the obstacles in its way by abolishing its own trade barriers.

There can be no doubt that Woodrow Wilson's outline of peace terms which embodied his famous Fourteen Points for a just and durable peace, the third of which called for "the elimination as far as possible of economic barriers," did much to break down the military morale of Germany and shorten the World War. As the German people realized what the old Imperial German Government had gotten them into they rose in revolution against it and it fell. It was the German Republic which sent its delegates to Versailles, where Wilson's Fourteen Points were cast into the discard and the Treaty of Vengeance was imposed on the German Republic.

I need not recite the many years during which the democratic and conciliatory elements in Germany sought ameliorations and concessions from the impossible terms of that treaty. In 1923 a young Austrian housepainter who had been discharged from the Army with the rank of sergeant, led a movement to overthrow the German Republic, declaring that conciliation would win nothing for Germany, and that Germany would get no relief until she was strong enough to take it by force. He failed and was imprisoned. He wrote a book, "Mein Kampf," and after his release from prison continued his efforts.

He had little success until in 1931. In that year, Germany and Austria decided to provide a little relief for themselves by abolishing the tariff wall between them

which was hampering their trade, and to form a customs union. This they invited their neighbors to join, pointing out that it was in line with the efforts of Briand of France and Stresemann of Germany to form a United States of Europe. It certainly did afford a nucleus for such a federation.

This undertaking required the consent of the League of Nations, to which the German Republic had adhered. Britain was complaisant, but France and Czechoslovakia, both strong citadels of the "Protectionist" superstition, interposed their imperative veto. Such a customs union could lead only to the political union of Germany and Austria, and they scented danger in that, though it is not easy to see what danger there could be in such a union if it were brought about amid general good feeling. As for Czechoslovakia, self interest should have dictated her joining the union, due to her geographical position. But the undertaking had to be abandoned.

That settled it. Germany thereafter lent a more willing ear to the preachings of the Austrian ex-sergeant and ex-housepainter, and two years later Hitler became Chancellor of Germany.

*Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord. I will repay!*

When the Allied representatives at Versailles and in the League of Nations decided on their policy of vengeance, confusing it with justice, they usurped the prerogative of God, and the consequences of this usurpation has come back to plague them.

The manner in which the present war is being conducted, each side "pulling its punches" as it were, like two gladiators in the prize ring, each knowing the other packs a twenty-mule team kick in either hand and anxious to avoid it, suggests that none of the warring nations really want the war, and that an early peace of some kind may yet be possible. But it must be an *economic peace*, such as was outlined by former President Wilson in his Fourteen Points, and also in a resolution passed by the German Reichstag in July, 1917, to which neither the Imperial German Government nor the Allied governments paid any attention.

They join house to house, lay field to field.

Why is Russia attacking Finland?

For ages Russia, with nearly half the territory and material resources of Europe and Asia, and in no need of territory in itself, has been seeking a commercial outlet on warm water, her vast extent of seacoast on the Arctic Ocean being useless. This was the main reason for her war on Turkey in 1878. This was the reason for her leasing Port Arthur from China, which aroused Japan's fears and resulted in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905. Britain and Germany deprived her of her aims in 1878, and no one knows what would have been the result in 1905 had not President Theodore Roosevelt intervened and brought about a peace by which she lost Port Arthur and its hinterland to Japan. And now this

desire for an outlet to the sea is driving Russia on to Finland. Is such laying of field to field necessary? Would not free trade accomplish the same thing?

"Free trade is the best peacemaker," said Richard Cobden a century ago. It is—it is the *only* peacemaker. But Richard Cobden uttered another epigram which every one should paste in his hat where he can see it frequently:

*"Free trade is the international law of the Almighty!"*

Trade is the mother of civilization, for without trade none of us could have anything except what he could make himself unaided by others—a condition of savagery lower than anything we have seen. To broaden trade is to extend and deepen civilization. To restrict trade is to narrow and retard civilization.

Free trade teaches us that there are others in the world with whom we must seek relationships on an equal basis. The destructive course the nations today are pursuing is "that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth." If they persist in this damnable policy of "Beggar my Neighbor," civilization is doomed.

## Sonnet—The Peace Maker

THERE is one way to checkmate future wars:  
Take down the spite-wall tariffs! Let in trade,  
Peace-loving Commerce. Her, the sons of Mars,  
With all their bluster, cannot quite evade.  
But they will start their "dumping" we are told—  
These foreigners, whose cunning we concede:  
Well, let them *dump!* for my part I won't scold,  
If they fill *my* back yard with things I need.

For we *are* bargain hunters—all of us:  
Only a few are Robber Tariff pets:  
If most of us become necessitous,  
Our loss is what the Tariff baron gets.  
*Down with the tariff!* For every boat load in,  
One must go out—and Trade Revival win!

HORATIO.

## Wrath Over "Grapes"

THERE seems to be dynamite in that best-seller, "Grapes of Wrath," by John Steinbeck! It is banned in California; a St. Louis Library Board has ordered its three copies burned; in another state it has been prohibited by the censors.

A question arises: Are these authorities utilizing some occasional obscenities in the book as an excuse for banning it, in order to prevent its powerful picture of the woes of the landless from becoming too well known?

—G. I. C.

## Causerie

### CABBAGES AND KINGS

ON March 22, 1765, "the king having had his first attack of insanity," approved the Stamp Act sponsored by Lord Granville, says the historian.

- 1 shilling tax upon ecclesiastical-court documents.
- 6 pounds tax upon a grant or privilege from a governor.
- 2 pounds tax upon a college degree.
- 4 pence tax upon a bill of lading.
- 10 shillings tax upon a public job paying 20 pounds per year.
- 4 pounds tax upon a public job paying more than 20 pounds per year.
- 4 pounds tax upon a liquor license.
- 1 shilling tax upon playing cards.
- 10 shillings tax upon a pair of dice.
- $\frac{1}{2}$  penny tax upon a half-sheet newspaper.
- 1 penny tax upon a whole sheet newspaper.
- 1 shilling tax upon a pamphlet.
- 2 shillings tax upon an advertisement.
- 2 pence tax upon an almanac.
- Etc., etc., etc., through fifty-five items.

This is our first discovery of kingly insanity being joined, in the same breath, with taxes upon industry. Lord Granville may have been aware of the opportune moment for such approval.

It would be enlightening to learn by what manner of sane reasoning Lord Granville proposed a shilling tax upon playing cards as against a ten-shilling tax upon dice; by what logic was the ten-shilling tax upon a 20 pound income jumped to a four pound tax upon an income of 20 pounds one shilling four pence half penny; by what power of deduction a penny tax upon a one-sheet newspaper was boosted to a shilling tax if the news-sheet was folded into a pamphlet.

There may have been a definite distinction between the lordly sanity which created the tax list and the kingly insanity which sanctioned it. This distinction no doubt stems from the "ancient and hoary wisdom" of which we heard so much during our law school days.

These were the days when Benjamin Franklin was actively engaged in opposing the motherland's tax methods as applied to our colonies, whilst, at the same time he was actively furthering the Grand Ohio Company's scheme to acquire twenty millions of colonial acres at a price of about ten cents for forty acres.

The landed gentry's tax torture of Franklin's fellow-men stirred him to action:

"If my countrymen should ever wish for the honor of having among them a gentry enormously wealthy, let them sell their farms and pay racked rents; the scale of the landlords will rise as that of the tenants is de-

pressed, who will soon become poor, tattered, dirty, and abject in spirit."

The Grand Ohio Company, supported by Franklin, made a heroic attempt to acquire enormous wealth by the very same means which Franklin deplored in the home-land's economic set-up.

Verily, kingly insanity may have been cause for national grief, but we find little choice between the sanities and insanities of men who agree to tax industry until revolutions result.

### SOLVING MYSTERIES

A mystery which long has mystified our savants—since 1823, to be exact—finally succumbs to scrutiny.

Harking back o'er the centuries we come to a day in 1300 B. C. when a papyrus rolled off the press bearing an inscription as intelligible, to subsequent savants, as is today's Chinese laundry ticket to us. Naturally, being a papyrus, the document proceeded, in a matter-of-fact way, to become priceless regardless of what its unknown message meant. Real, old-time papyrus isn't obtainable on every five-and-ten stationery counter or book-rack. That the papyrus had something to say in an incomprehensive manner was no detraction from its value as a literary leaflet, consequently it escaped being used for kindling the kitchen fire as sacrilegiously as Republicans and Democrats and Socialists use Single Tax pamphlets because the simple language utterly confuses them.

In 1823 the Sardinian government stepped into the literary breach and buckled down to decoding the hieroglyphics. Specifically, the honorable Gustav Seyffart made the first venture at opening this literary oyster on behalf of the Sardinian savants and civil servants, but the best he could do was to analyse the texture of the papyrus and the weave of its fibres. Criminologists use the same methods today when tackling mysteries.

It wasn't until Professor Giulio Farina, the eminent Italian Egyptologist, took over the payprus puzzle ten years ago that the document was doomed as a mystery. In ten years' toil, to the year, this expert exposed to vulgar gaze the paper's meaning which heretofore had meant much less than a Wall Street ticker-tape and almost as little as a Bronx belle's first-year shorthand. Now that the mystery is solved it seems incredible that its exposure was any more difficult than opening a can of sardines in 1823.

The papyrus puzzle is simple. If we gave you ten guesses we are sure that nine of them would be "taxes," and you'd be right nine times out of ten.

And so 'tis now known that 'way, 'way back in 1300 B. C., in the day of Menes, tax lists were published and peddled just as is done by our meanies of today—tax lists which lumined the levies on inhabitants of a Lybian desert oasis (just as our assessors reach out their lean,

long, legal index-fingers to put on the spot our hicks out in the sticks). There is nothing so simple as puzzles once the light dawns, and inasmuch as tax lists always have ranked first we wonder why our savants of eighteen dynasties couldn't guess the subject matter long ago.

If mankind would but always keep taxation in mind, how long could any mystery remain a mystery? The mystery of poverty in the midst of plenty—the mystery of depressions in the midst of genius and untold natural resources—the mystery of millions of idle men in the midst of millions of idle acres?

When the subject-matter of a document is unknown, what else can it be but taxes?

### LABORS IN VAIN

It is a far cry from Cleon and his civic notions down to this year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty. Cleon was a man with ideas, 429 B. C. He had aspirations somewhat comparable to those of a present-day alderman; that is to say, his notions were about as fitful and as fantastic when it came to pumping the bilge on the Ship of State. Cleon believed that if the poor had no bread to eat—well, let 'em eat cake, and to provide the cake Cleon whooped up the wage scale.

Two thousand four hundred years have cluttered the calendar since Cleon's notions proved to be not so hot, and in the interim an assortment of other notables have followed in his footsteps down the sands of Time, all of whom have aimed to brighten up the short and simple annals of the poor.

About 140 B. C. Polybius felt the urge to take his pen in hand and call the bluff of his political representatives who loosely used the words "freedom and democracy" whilst getting ready for the subsequent mob-rule. Then along came Diocletian, about 240 years after Polybius had cried "What's the use!", and he, the aforesaid Diocletian, took to monkeying with the gold content in the standard coin. Nothing startling occurred, however, except the customary "flop" in the program.

By the time the year 370 A. D. had rolled around the levying of taxes ranked as indoor sport No. 1 and, at this time it is alleged, there were as many tax collectors as tax payers which established a fifty-fifty basis in the art of getting and confiscating the coin of the realm. Things came to such a pretty pass that by 700 A. D. Herodotus was seized with the same urge that overcame Polybius, and the old "Hero" wrote a snappy column about the loss of individual rights and the discarding of old customs for a set of danged, new-fangled ideas.

The humanitarian urge to succor the idle poor in the midst of idle acres still persisted like the barber's itch and, in 1079 A. D., "the Chinese socialist," Wang An-Shih, was given carte blanche to lift humanity by its boot-straps. For ten long years he subjected society

to socialism, until he and his cohorts were classed as false alarms and were unceremoniously exiled to Mongolia.

Matters continued to alternate between hay and grass—between chills and fevers—until the same old Polybius-Herodotus urge made a return visit through the pen and hand of our own Ben Franklin in 1787. Ben summed up the previous innings in the age-old game of taxation, ambition and avarice and opined that our freedom and democracy—the same old stuff of Cleon's day—was aheadin' for a monarchy; and in 1850 Herbert Spencer nods his head and sez: "Them's my sentiments, too." By 1929 H. L. Mencken had delivered himself of his irritation over our grumbling farmers and ventured the drastic notion that farmers ought to be abolished.

As we look back over the pages of history it is apparent that we cannot accuse civic leaders of precipitousness in inquiring into the drab details and dreary days of "the poor ye have always with you." Nor can we accuse our modern colleges of ill-considered haste. Rather, a very conservative, cautious and slow approach has been made toward the ultimate economic freedom of the masses.

So while our judicial intellects are trying to find under which shell the economic pea is hiding—whilst Congress is nonplussed over the total lack of altruism on the part of our wealthy taxpayers, who thriftily take advantage of every loophole in every unworkable tax law on private enterprise—it is our ambition to raise a fund in the sum of ten millions of dollars in the next thirty days, with which to found an institute to compile every fix-it program which thus far has failed to improve on the laws of Nature.

Our institute will mail, every thirty minutes, a list of all unworkable social experiments which have been tried by man since the first tax on cave-homes was levied in accordance with the distance penetrated by the sunlight into the mouth of the cave. These thirty-minute mailings will go forward to each and every legislative member who is too lazy to read history and who believes that his own thoughts are original in the field of taxation, labor disputes and paternalism.

We hope that our labors shall not have been in vain.

By THOMAS N. ASHTON

**T**HERE is nothing so pathetic as the jobless man who is totally ignorant of his rights to use the earth. . . . An aimless, wretched, hungry man is a blasphemy and a contradiction of the intention of the Creator!

—FRANCIS NEILSON in "Man at the Crossroads."

**M**EN like Henry George are rare, unfortunately. One cannot imagine a more beautiful combination of intellectual keenness, artistic form, and fervent love of justice. Every line is written as if for our generation.

—ALBERT EINSTEIN.

## Experience and the Future

By HON. JACKSON H. RALSTON

THOSE who may be classed as followers of Henry George have experienced a number of relatively slight advances and several severe checks. From the advances we have learned and can learn comparatively little. Our checks should be studied and they can teach us much if we examine them.

Following the apparently well-reasoned views of Henry George, those believing in his fundamentals have sought as the line of least resistance the gradual, or immediate, removal of all taxation from improvements and personal property and its transference to land values. In this way they have hoped to bring about equality in the gifts of Nature to all men. Acting upon this belief they have, in the United States, fought unsuccessful state-wide campaigns in Oregon, Missouri and California. In no instance have they come within striking distance of a favorable result. The last and perhaps most interesting attempt was in California in 1938. Into this recurrent condition let us make at least a superficial examination.

Are these failures the result of the groundlessness of the fundamentals for the recognition of which we have striven? None of us will accept this idea. As long as we continue to believe that all men have an equal right to life, we must recognize that the denial of such right must lead to human misery and the removal of existing wrongs as speedily as possible is righteous and imperative.

Accepting this hypothesis as indisputable, why then is not our proposition immediately accepted by the electorate, only a small percentage of which in any reasonable theory should oppose it?

Has such refusal of acceptance been due to want of education? Necessary as education in economics is, I do not think so. Better stated, I should say that I do not believe that any attainable degree of education will change the result. To illustrate, the number of men coming of age at any moment will, by an infinite number of times exceed the possible number which will take on education. (This will be entirely true unless we enlarge the meaning of the word "education" to include those who are instructed by their feelings and observation.) Useful as book-learning is, it is insufficient and a large percentage of such learners on an actual test will be swept off their feet by what they esteem to be their immediate self-interest. Education alone cannot be the answer.

In California we were opposed by every great interest in the State. With general unanimity the press, save for the Labor papers, fought us. As with one voice they spoke for their masters, the great financial institutions, the large landowners, the real estate dealers, Chambers of Commerce, farm organizations and all the bodies these could control, including the State and subordinate govern-

ments, women's organizations, service clubs, to a large degree, and others. The wonder is, not that we received only 372,000 votes, or about 18 per cent of those cast, but that we had such a large following.

But how came it that even the bodies of which I have spoken were able to mislead the electorate against the interests of the great majority? What appeal could they make to win success? Assuredly they must have made some appeal to large sections of the electorate.

From such examination as I have been able to make I believe the Opposition made a very successful play for the votes of the vast majority of householders and those they controlled. This one influence easily represented two-thirds or more of the electorate.

It may be asked how such an appeal could be successful in the face of the ultimate extinction of all taxation upon improvements and tangible personal property as proposed by us. The argument is this: "The Single Taxers say you will be relieved from house and certain other taxation. Very well. But where will the taxes rest? They will be laid on land values and wipe them out. You have worked hard to get the land on which to build. To all intents that land is to be taken from you and thrown into common ownership. This is near communism. Of what worth is it to you to be relieved from certain taxes if you are to lose your land?"

I need not stop to point out the shortcomings of this argument. The householder was in a panic of fear. With our success he saw all he had labored for taken from him, or at least his ownership rendered insecure. Nothing we could say or do could affect a mind impregnated with fear. Eyes and ears were closed against men who, they were told, would so wrong the home owner.

Again from the standpoint of a certain number our proposition seemed essentially immoral. In those cases the argument ran somewhat as follows: "People have invested their savings in land—perhaps buying for a home or for speculation, if you please. They have hoped thus to preserve their savings or, it may be, make some small profit. You Single Taxers come along and destroy all their hopes—hopes based upon the expected continuance of long-established relations for which every one in the community is responsible. This is wrong."

Again I shall not take time with the reply which seems to me conclusive. Those taking this position believed they were defending the cause of public morality and that we were antagonistic to human right.

Then the farmer. In many instances where the assessed value of his improvements was less than that of his land, his taxes, usually light in all circumstances, would be increased. He refused to look far enough to see that our plan would make a vastly better city market for his products than he now enjoys, this to his ultimate benefit. He thinks he is par excellence a land owner and for fifty years will refuse to see that his land values have been

and are being drained into the cities. With few exceptions he accepted the arguments of our opponents.

What conclusion is to be drawn from all this? We cannot undertake another campaign in California for a score of years, either by total or so-called "step-by-step" measures with the slightest hope of success. Past failures, of which I have spoken serve to confirm this belief. And the like situation, as I see it, prevails in every other State in the Union. The same forces and the same misrepresentations which have triumphed here will prevail elsewhere in like endeavors and this will, there, as here, hold for twenty years to come.

Does this mean that we are to remain hopeless and inert? I do not so believe, but it does mean that we have a lot more thinking to do as to the methods.

First, of course, methods of education in economics are to be cultivated.

Next we must develop popular government. Legislatures will be managed by adverse influences for a generation to come, perhaps several generations. The Initiative and Referendum must be materially revised and extended to new states. In California, for instance, it has become practically unworkable.

More importantly, we must study a new approach. I am sure that at some point the citadel of privilege will be found vulnerable. What that point may be I am not wise enough to say today. Want of success in our endeavors proves we have not yet struck the weakest spot.

It may well be that we should attack the great landed estates in city and country. The man who holds 10,000 acres imperfectly cultivated in the country or \$50,000 in land in the cities with only slum dwellings has few sympathizers.

Again there is a natural human feeling that every man is entitled to enough land to live upon and sustain his family. Shall we avail ourselves of this? Would this be departing in any degree from our basic principle of equality in human rights if we were to declare that thus much land every man shall enjoy without paying taxes to the state? Would this not be a true homestead exemption? It is interesting to remember that Lycurgus divided the lands of Sparta into equal holdings—with each man entitled to his own and with no right to transmit by inheritance.

It seems to me quite possible that on some such presentation our theories will offer a new appeal. Then at any rate it would not be said that we sought to take from a man the land on which his house rested. Only the pure land speculator would be left out in the cold.

The popularity of homestead exemption should suggest something to us. To extend its protection to assault from the State as well as to the grasp of creditors has much in its favor. This kind of proposition no householder would fear. Secure in the friendship of the home owner, our further advance should be repaid.

## Land and Landless

THE following interesting information about land ownership throughout the world appeared in the December, 1939, issue of *Progress*, a Georgeist journal published at Melbourne, Australia:

"In Great Britain when the last survey was made some 40,000 people—one-tenth of 1 per cent—owned nearly three-quarters of the country. Some 44 millions owned no land whatever. In Scotland 96.4 per cent owned no land. Twenty-five landowners claim to own one-third of Scotland. In Wales recently the Marquis of Bute (Scotch) sold 117,000 acres, including half the City of Cardiff for £40,000,000. In Australia 85 per cent of the people are landless. In Italy more than two-thirds of the land is owned by less than 4 per cent of the landowners. One-half of one per cent possess 47 per cent of all the cultivated land. 40,000,000 own no land whatever. In Hungary one-third owns no land. The Esterhazy Estate of 223,287 acres includes 159 villages. In Poland 70 per cent are peasants in appalling conditions. One aristocrat owned 340,000 acres. In Czechoslovakia a land reform administration was appointed to function. Germany has crushed that advance. In Spain before the recent struggle 1 per cent owned 51.5 per cent of the land. 65 per cent owned only 2.2 per cent. Franco supported by Germany and Italy fought to retain these conditions. In Mexico in 1910 2 per cent owned 70 per cent of the land. In the United States 16 people own 47,800,000 acres of timber lands. In Manhattan (New York) 1 per cent own about 85 per cent of the island, valued at 4,022,000,000 dollars (1937). In the United States 75 per cent do not own their own farms. Denmark shows progress. In Denmark only 5 per cent of the farms are held by tenants. The Georgean Movement is strong there. Until interfered with by Japan it was growing in China. In Japan half the arable land is owned by about 1½ per cent of the total population. 22,000,000 try to exist on about one acre per household. The density of population is only half that of England. In Nanking, China, 12,000 delegates were to meet last September to discuss the policy of collecting economic rent and the abolition of taxation. The publication office of their paper was destroyed by the Japanese."

IF I am asked, what system of political philosophy I substituted for that which, as a philosophy, I had abandoned, I answer, "No system: only a conviction that the true system was something much more complex and many-sided than I had previously had any idea of, and that its office was to supply, not a set of model institutions, but principles from which the institutions suitable to any given circumstances might be deduced."

—"Autobiography," by JOHN STUART MILL.

## The Sharecroppers

By GRACE ISABEL COLBRON

**A**T long last, Washington is taking the matter up. A conference has been called, this second week of January,\* for a meeting of "all interested groups" to consider the matter of the sharecroppers facing eviction from their homes in Missouri, Arkansas and Mississippi.

These "interested groups" include landowners, sharecroppers, Federal and State officials, and it's an easy guess that the landowners will be the first to present their side of the question, and to get the notice of the press.

It's a full year now, since the sharecroppers sprang into public attention by a revolt of the dispossessed who, nearly one thousand strong, camped beside a public highway in Missouri. That made the front page, that became news. For the moment only, until other front page news supplanted it. But for a few weeks this mass migration of whites and negroes driven from their poor unstable homes by . . . well, the landlords blamed it on "mechanization of farming," and that is the way most of the newspapers presented it to the general public. Said general public, hardened by now to apparently unavoidable conditions of poverty and unemployment, filed this case with the others and forgot about it.

But not everybody forgot. A series of excellent articles in one evening paper, a couple of good novels (particularly "The Sharecropper," by Charlie May Simon) painted the picture in colors of such strength that some of the public at least must have realized this worst of all examples of the evils of landlordism our country has to show. The situation *has* been realized sufficiently to call forth this conference in Washington, which may either bring it all up to the light of public knowledge—or else smother it completely under pages, and hours of official discussion. It is to be expected that the landowners will give the keynote of the discussion, and that the press notices will follow suit. It will be interesting to watch. There may be something more to say about this in subsequent numbers of *LAND AND FREEDOM*.

Meanwhile, let us take up the matter as it now stands. Who are the sharecroppers? They are—officially—merely tenant farmers in the South Atlantic States, the East South Central States and the West South Central States. The evils of tenant farming in Europe and in other parts of our country are well known by now. It was these evils in Europe that brought thousands of good farm workers into our country as immigrants, hoping to get a little farm of their own. And most of us know how many of these immigrants found themselves again tenants of new landlords in America—and in enough cases, of the same

landlords they had left at home! Small choice of results anyway.

But this sort of tenant farming, bad as it is, is mild, compared to that known as sharecropping, in the cotton lands of the Southern states of East and West. Here the arrangement known as "sharecropping" means that the tenant receives a small share of the cotton he has picked for his landlord, is therefore subject to uncertainty as to cotton prices, and extra deductions from the landlord. Also he has to buy at the "commissary store", which takes what little he has earned, said store being usually run by the landlord. At the very most, the average cash income of sharecropper families in a number of states has, for a long time, been less than \$200 a year. At the end of the year, the cropper generally finds himself in debt to the store-keeper and the landlord.

This was certainly bad enough, but at least the sharecropper had his little home, such as it was, and a feeling of stability with it. Then came the AAA and other well-meant government schemes to help the farm tenant by raising the price of cotton. They helped—in a very few cases. But in by far the greater number of cases, the increased return from cotton prices was absorbed by the landlords, and the sharecropper was worse off than before. Much worse, because the majority of landlords, desirous of capturing the entire benefit of the Federal program, began to change from a sharecropping system to a day-labor system. In other words, the sharecroppers, who had lived up till then on the big plantations in homes that were quite rickety, but still their own, now became mere day laborers with no right to anything but the low wage of a Southern farm day worker, for a few weeks, or at most a few months of work in the year.

This, finally, brought about the mass revolt that won newspaper notices (for a week or so at least) for the hundreds of former sharecroppers camped beside the Missouri highways. Work was found for some of them, charity helped a few others, about five hundred were placed in a better organized camp, largely by the efforts of a negro preacher who undertook to arouse public sympathy.

But sympathy is not the final remedy for a situation growing worse each day. And blaming the plight of dispossessed, wandering, homeless farm workers on "mechanization of farm work" is not an explanation, nor is it a solution of the problem.

It will be interesting to see how the Congressional Conference in Washington works out this problem. What solution will that Conference find for the ever-growing troubles resulting from the fact that a few may possess the earth needed by all?

**A Free Copy of LAND AND FREEDOM  
is an invitation to become a subscriber.**

\*This article was submitted early in January of this year.—Ed.

## The College of Tomorrow

By J. H. McMIX

A LARGE corporate enterprise bought space in a Metropolitan daily newspaper to advertise an idea. They said: "We must do more along the lines of vocational education and adaption to prepare youth for the world of tomorrow. We must make it possible for more of our deserving young people to attend institutions of higher learning—an enrollment of 1,250,000 students out of a population of 130,000,000 is not enough." Two thoughts are here conveyed; one of practical preparation of hand and mind, and the other stressing a quantitative increase in the desire for education.

Ezra Pound, considered by many to be an authority on education, tells us that, "real education must ultimately be limited to men who insist on knowing; the rest is mere sheep herding." We have now before us two opinions, differing, but not necessarily in conflict. We cannot be certain what Pound means by "real education." If fundamental economics, taught with the same intensity as other major studies, is included, we cannot quarrel on that point. But when we think of having encountered college graduates, who claim the distinction of having majored in economics and still have but scant acquaintance with fundamental axioms and definitions, we must confess to some amazement.

The College of Today finds it difficult to abandon the "sheep herding" theory of education. Very, little if any, encouragement is offered to students for constructive thinking. Rarely does it profit a student to question the ideas of his Professor or the adopted textbook. The standing of a student in his class depends largely on his ability to hastily scribble notes in lecture periods and if endowed with a fair memory, he earns his mark accordingly. A parrot can be taught to say many things, but does he know what he is talking about? Scientific economists will continue to find "sheep herding" in education difficult of acceptance.

Still another viewpoint is obtained from a recent report of the Carnegie Foundation on Pennsylvania Schools. It advances the theory that we are now educating the wrong people in college; that there are too many young people of high academic calibre who are denied the opportunity because of economic circumstances. Something might be done to induce the Carnegie Foundation to recognize that the circumstances complained of may be directly attributed to the sort of economics with which the student is confronted upon his entry in the halls of higher education. The problem, in its entirety, cannot be sidestepped, nor should it be dismissed lightly.

Real conflict of opinion regarding education in colleges does not begin until qualitative methods are under discussion. It may, perhaps, be just as well that the percentage of college students to population is low, when

we consider the product upon emerging. If the College of Today persists in disregarding economic fundamentals, little hope can be held out for the youth girded with a parchment issued by the College of Tomorrow.

A recent issue of the *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* suggests succinctly the trend of our educational problem: "As goes this throng of youth, so, in the years to come, goes the nation." Could the *Bulletin* editors have been thinking about the attacks to which both Harvard and Yale have been subjected for keeping "radical" professors? The University of Oklahoma is on the gridiron for teaching Communism. The assumption that the teaching of all doctrines, radical and conservative alike, is undemocratic, is wholly incompatible with democratic tradition. Tolerance of ideas is the essence of democracy.

It is the business of universities to teach Communism, Fascism, Bolshevism, Mormonism, Mesmerism, Republicanism and any other ism—but without fear or favor. The sin is in showing favoritism for *any* ism. How can a student be expected to make comparisons of philosophies and ideologies if only one is taught to the exclusion of all the other theories for social betterment? Under the direction of impartial tutors a student may accept or reject a point of view entirely in accordance with his ability to reason and differentiate. It is a flaw in reasoning to ask that no disturbing issues be touched upon in a university course; or to assume that students should emerge from college with exactly the same ideas with which they entered. Such a process would hardly be education.

The most far-reaching influence of education may be said to be qualitative rather than quantitative. The importance of a nation in its influence for good upon other nations depends upon the quality of thought and action of the people constituting such a nation. A single directing force may accomplish the greatest good—or the greatest harm. An Emerson, a Whitman, a Jefferson, can by the very force of their ideas affect their contemporaries as well as bequeath the quality of their spirit to succeeding ages.

The College of Tomorrow may well heed the need for the control of emotion. We are too often confronted with a theory of education which maintains that the latest fact conquers, when in truth we really live in a world in which the predominant emotion conquers. Business is built up or destroyed, laws are enforced or flouted, lives are redeemed or wrecked, all by love and hate. The college that does not recognize the importance of emotional training is derelict in its duty.

It is a large order to assign the responsibility for the present day curricula, for the selection and limitation of text books, and the methods employed in the propagation of a higher education. Many people who cherish their independence of thought and action have been greatly concerned about the possible influences which could be exerted by the creators of foundations and endowments. It is a serious matter to file an indictment of subservience against the faculty of any college. But what is one to



think, when confronted so repeatedly with the consistent refusal of faculties to accept and expound simple truths?

There evidently must be a vast number of teachers in our universities who are obliged to adopt the lines of least resistance, in order to assure their tenure. In the business-world, such individuals are characterized as "yes-men," and they seem somehow, not only to get along, but manage to get on, as well. But they never become outstanding personalities, such as we are so sorely in need of, both in the business-world and in our college faculties.

Who knows how significant may be the power of external influences? A man whose testimony cannot be disregarded and who has a broad experience as a college teacher and professor, recently remarked in the course of a public address: "I witnessed many honorary degrees conferred on philanthropically inclined gentlemen with profound citations; and I have heard those old rascals expound *their* theories of political economy, which were wholly incompatible with recognized authorities." All of which only adds to the problem, and emphasizes the injunction that it *cannot be sidestepped nor should it be dismissed lightly*.

Another task for the College of Tomorrow is to recognize that the need for straight thinking in economics is at least as important as in other fields of learning. That this is not yet recognized is well illustrated by the following story.

A small group of college professors were discussing the proceedings after one of the sessions of a New York State Conference of Single Taxers, back in 1914. They happened to be there, because the meetings were held in an upper New York University, through the courtesy of its head. Among those present was the Professor of Economics and the Professor of Engineering, who, much to the consternation of the former, gave his hearty approval to the proceedings. The Professor of Economics, in the most gentlemanly manner, touched with unmistakable signs of sarcasm, could not understand how such a highly trained technician could subscribe to such views. It was unbelievable, he said, that such an outstanding Engineer could not see through the fallacy of the proposals.

The Engineer maintained a dignified calm while the Economist was verbally chastising him. Finally the Engineer replied: "You see, my dear Professor, it does not matter a great deal what you teach *your* students. If they do not understand their text-books, they soon forget that they ever took up economics. If, perchance, what you teach, should permeate their skulls, and even if it turns out to be wrong, nothing very serious can result which cannot eventually be corrected. But in my department, it is entirely different. My greatest problem is to teach my students to think straight. And the penalty for their failure, or inability to think straight, is that the bridge will fall."

## Prophetic Words,

I CAME upon a sentence which I submit is prophetic in high degree:

"Is it too soon to hope that it may be the mission of this Republic to unite all nations of English speech, whether they grow beneath the Northern Star or Southern Cross, in a league, which, by insuring justice, promoting peace and liberating commerce, will be the forerunner of a world-wide federation that will make war the possibility of a past age and turn to works of usefulness the enormous forces now dedicated to destruction?"

Those words were spoken in San Francisco by Henry George in a Fourth of July oration, 1877. They are prophetic in their insight and prophetic in their appeal.

Shall we sit still indefinitely and let the world drift with all which that may mean, or shall we concern ourselves with the task of leadership in a broken, impoverished, and war-torn world? Shall we lead, or shall we sit and watch and wait and take the consequences?

—DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

## Natural Government\*

BY T. E. McMILLAN

AS one who had put in ten or more years of hard and enthusiastic work on behalf of social justice, holy justice, honest government, an equitable distribution of wealth, aiming to relieve man of the fierce, tigerish struggle for mere material sustenance, the conviction slowly dawned upon me that we shall never get this vision realized until we adopt the form of government fashioned for us by the Creator.

The word "factitious": "artificial, as contrasted with natural; sham, unreal, spurious," is a good description of our forms of government in the world today, and while we have them it will be useless for the world's statesmen to "reason together," for such conferences could only be like a modern Tower of Babel. Let us, in chastened mood, observe Nature's method of government, that is, the divine way.

We actually did adopt God's form of government when we first came out of the jungle into the clearing, but we have, in the complexity of progress, got right away from our natural social foundations. So we are back in the jungle. When we adopt the system God made for us, we shall have the master key to the solution of the social problems that now baffle and break the hearts of high-minded men and women. The Natural Laws are all simple, direct, unchangeable. By obeying them we shall come to the Kingdom on Earth, and by no other way. They are of the Kingdom. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness" (that is, rightness, justice), "and all these things" (material well-being) "shall be added unto you."

\* From "This Struggle," reviewed in this issue.

## Private Enterprise

BY LOUIS WALLIS

(Abridged)\*

**P**PRIVATE enterprise is the most precious economic force in civilization! Everything possible must be done to safeguard it against Communistic-Socialist onslaught and Nazi reactionism—both of which are now aiming deadly blows, not only against freedom in our country, but seeking to pull down the entire business regime of the world.

The only constructive proposal to safeguard private enterprise,—the only logical pathway of advance between the communistic “left” and the reactionary “right,”—is offered by the simple and easily effected program of Georgeism.

### OUR FEUDAL SYSTEM

Georgeism seeks *the liberation of business* from certain feudalistic restraints embedded in the laws which we inherit from Europe. Already endorsed in principle by a heavy majority of the London County Council, and by two hundred and thirty municipal councils throughout England, Scotland and Wales, Georgeism is the latest phase of the struggle made through centuries to establish democracy and secure emancipation from kingly and aristocratic tyranny.

Our intolerable fiscal system, which threatens to smother private enterprise, is not native to America. It is a European invention. It was contrived long ago through the influence of the European ground-landlord class, whose ancestors and predecessors acquired the soil of every country in the Old World by military power and conquest. Let us therefore briefly consider the nature of the malevolent force which bears down with steadily increasing weight upon American business.

All governments in Europe were based at the start upon military adventure,—of which a good example is the Norman conquest of England. The conquerors of each country divided the *ground* among themselves, and thus gave rise to ground-landlord aristocracies enthroned above the peasant-masses in every community.

From this exalted position, the upper classes looked down upon the peasantry with disdain. They compelled the farm workers to pay *land-rent* for the soil, and also *taxes* to support the State.

In the midst of this agricultural world, a gradual up-growth of commerce and manufacture took place. Slowly and almost imperceptibly, the business class was born. And the ground-landlords looked with the same contempt upon business men as upon farmers. The growing tax burdens of Europe were piled more and more upon manu-

facture and commerce; *while at the same time, the landed estates and ground rental incomes of the aristocracy were wholly or partly exempted from taxation.* In other words, the European fiscal method is to *penalize* productive capital by heavy taxes, while *promoting* speculation in land, as well as *protecting* ground-rent as a perquisite of special privilege.

The European, aristocratic method of taxation was brought into America during our colonial period; and, with modifications of detail, it has persisted until now. That all kinds of productive enterprise—trade, manufacture, etc., are being smothered with burdensome taxation, is a fact which the reader probably realizes from personal knowledge. The reader also knows from personal observation that city lots, and vast amounts of ground in the rural districts and the immediate suburbs of all municipalities, are held idle *on a scale of assessment much lower than the tax rate upon private enterprise of all kinds.*

This problem was not so pressing at earlier periods of American history as it is today, for the reason that the burden of taxation was much *lighter* than it is now, and also because a big western frontier of territory open to emigration had the effect of keeping down the rental and selling price of land. But the silent and sinister operation of European tax methods in America has actively promoted speculative land-holding in this country; so that, gradually and imperceptibly, all unused ground of any promise whatever,—from coast to coast—has been taken up to idle holdings, while at the same time, the main burden of taxation has been thrown upon private enterprise of all kinds.

Thus, the total structure of American business—from coast to coast—finds itself in practically the same economic position as that of European industry. In other words, just because *vacant* lands, and the ground rentals of *occupied* sites, are assessed in lower degree than productive capital,—*just for this reason, private enterprise the country over is compelled to carry the double burden of high taxes and heavy ground-rent.* The problem is a mere matter of economic arithmetic.

We need more production of goods, more housing, more employment of labor, and greater purchasing power among the masses of our people. But in the present economic and fiscal set-up, the cards are all stacked against the widest and freest use of capital in productive enterprise. Production is *over-taxed*; while the mere holding of ground (whether vacant or leased) is comparatively *under-taxed*. Hence, there emerges into view the phenomenon of *ground-rent* available for appropriation by land holders as an unearned income parasitically burdening the entire industrial structure.

### THE GEORGEIST SOLUTION

To relieve business enterprise from this intolerable economic pressure, Georgeism proposes to shift the burden-

\* *Private Enterprise*, a new thirty-four page pamphlet, is now available. We recommend it for distribution among business men. See advertisement on back page.—ED.

of taxation gradually from productive capital (i.e., improvements, machinery, merchandise, etc.) to the ground rentals of land *already in use* and to the value of land *held out of use on speculation*. That this proposal does not aim simply to tax vacant land alone, should be emphatically noted.

Georgeism therefore proposes to *reverse* the aristocratic, lop-sided, European fiscal methods which now penalize American productive capital, which promote land speculation, and which protect unearned ground rentals from specially heavy taxation. The reversal is to be accomplished by assessing land in one column, and improvements, etc., in a separate parallel column; shifting the tax burden from productive enterprise to the rent of occupied sites, as well as to the value of ground held vacant on speculation.

Georgeism, then, is a declaration that European fiscal methods are incompatible with private enterprise and popular government, and that democracy cannot survive indefinitely against the pressure of aristocratic taxation. *To oppose Georgeism is, by implication, to favor the fiscal system devised by ground landlords of the Old World and foisted upon America during the colonial period when this country was in leading strings to Europe.*

#### THE ERRORS OF MARXISM

According to Karl Marx in his "Communist Manifesto" (1848) and the first volume of his "Kapital" (1867); and according to his disciples who are known as socialists and communists; and according to many "intelligentsia" who do not call themselves communists or socialists *but who promote Marxist ways of thought*;—according to the ideology of this movement, *modern "capitalism" represents the victory of the "bourgeoisie" over the ground-landlord aristocracy of Europe.*

Marx wrote his "Kapital" in England, where he had found refuge after being driven out of continental Europe. But England gives the lie to his "Communist Manifesto" and to the first volume of "Kapital" by the very facts of her history. Becoming "the work-shop of the world," England, for that reason, became the pattern for modern Parliamentary Democracy. And what is the essence of legislative popular government? The modern British Parliament has grown up at the point of a long-drawn-out compromise between ground-landlord interests, represented since the seventeenth century by the Tory party, and commercial-manufacturing interests represented by the Whig-Liberal party. This compromise finds no explicit recognition in substantive law. It was a tacit, under-cover agreement by which the powerful elite owners of the island gave increasing parliamentary representation and political power to the "middle class," and finally to the laboring class, on the understanding that fiscal burdens were to be laid more and more upon *industry*, while at the same time, taxes were to bear more lightly in proportion upon ground-rents of leased land as well

as upon the value of land held out of use on speculation and in private parties and hunting preserves. This compromise came silently to a climax under Chamberlain, who "de-rated," or untaxed, all vacant land in Britain.

These facts and their economic implications find no place in the standard ideology of Marx and his followers, whether called socialists, communists, or by any other label.

The innocent reader of Marx's *Kapital* (vol. I), or of Schuman's *International Politics*, would not suppose that the system so glibly called "capitalism" is affected by, or has anything to do with, such trifling—such mundane—such insignificant matters as taxation, ground-rent, enclosure of "common" lands and the speculative withholding of city lots. *These matters complicate the entire system and process of modern industry; and yet they find no mention in the picture of what Prof. Schuman calls the "contemporary tragedy" of capitalism* (p. 525). The ultimate conclusion of Marxism, therefore, is that the entire situation discloses a simple, open-and-shut issue between the "bourgeoisie," on the one hand, and the "working class," on the other. Our old friends, "Capital and Labor"!

*Marxism, in fact, got away to a wrong start by underwriting the uncritical, indiscriminate war between laboring people and their employers.*

Ignoring the specific issues raised above, Professor Shuman makes no reference to Henry George and his writings, while giving ample recognition to Marx. Thus George and the proposals of "Progress and Poverty" are beneath notice in a large volume on contemporary politics.

On the other hand, many Marxists, instead of ignoring the specific issues raised by Henry George, declare condescendingly that Georgeism is valid as far as it goes. Thus, Norman Thomas proclaims that the ground-rent of land is the greatest legalized racket! *Yet socialists and communists, and all persons who adhere to Marxian ideology, say that if taxation is transferred from productive capital to ground-rent and to vacant sites, the big private capitalist will have power to exploit labor, oppress the public and put other capitalists off the map.*

Georgeism plants itself squarely across this current Marxist assumption by pointing out that *untaxed* capital, on an earth set free of speculation and monopoly by the taxation of both used and unused ground, *will be regulated by free competition for the first time in history*. Productive capital instead of being simultaneously penalized by heavy taxes and compelled to earn ground-rent, will be encouraged by fiscal exemption and by the break-up of land monopoly. Ground-rent will be absorbed as public revenue in lieu of taxes on production. Capital will thus flow more freely into productive use, will assist in the employment of more labor and the creation of more goods, with augmented buying power among the masses of the people.

The Marxist apparently is unable to rid himself of

mental habits acquired in a monopolistic world where the ground is undertaxed, while capital and merchandise are heavily over-taxed. Here is the crux of the argument between Marxist and Georgeist. Large aggregates of capital can exploit labor, oppress the public, and put other capital off the map only in a regime such as now prevails, *where unused land is held on speculation in city and country; where occupied sites are ground-rented; and where industry is compelled to carry a burdensome tax-load.*

Marxist assumptions could not run in a Georgeist economy; because a capitalist who deliberately undertook to be oppressive could be liquidated by competitive capital in a free market, on the ground of service as against exploitation.

All Georgeists freely admit that labor is exploited by the present economic set-up; and consequently the huge productive mechanism of modern industry is, to a large degree, "unearned" by its ownership. But at the same time, Georgeism declares that whatever may be the origin of capital, it should be untaxed in order to be freely employed in private enterprise under conditions which create a rising demand for labor everywhere. The danger attaching to capital under prevailing fiscal methods is the fact of its operation within the terms of a *restricted economy* which not only gives the owners of capital too much control over labor, but, at the same time, blockades the onward march of business itself by unemployment, low buying power, and periodical "crises."

Privately owned capital-equipment possesses no arbitrary control over labor and the general public. When working people, for instance, are thrown out of employment by installation of new productive machinery, *capital seems to deprive labor of the opportunity to earn a living.* But labor-saving machinery would not appear so despotic if land monopoly, together with over-taxation of capital and merchandise, were not artificially restricting the progress of industry and limiting the amount of employment. In other words, new kinds of machinery would not spell tragedy to labor *if capital in general were untaxed and had freer access to land throughout the nation.* For in a Georgeist regime (with no fiscal penalty on productive capital; with ground-rent socialized by taxation; and with speculative landholding impossible), the discharge of workers at a given point would tend to be followed by re-employment elsewhere.

### PALLIATIVES ARE FUTILE

When the crash of 1929 came, the Republican party, after being in power for a decade, was helpless. The Democratic party presently took over the government; and while its policy has had no effect in relation to the fundamental problem, it has fed the poor by taxing the rich, and has prevented an uprising of the masses. But while the "New Deal" is only a stop-gap, its Republican

opponents are paralyzed by their inability to offer constructive criticism in a time of great national emergency. The Republican politicians, in fact, are showing up as poorly as did their predecessors the Whigs in the days of Webster, when that party was on the way out. If the Republicans carried the country, they would have to continue most of the New Deal, or confront a situation which nobody would care to face. There is no constructive statesmanship in either of the big parties; and the country will have nothing to do with Marxism or Naziism.

"But," says a reader, "suppose the Republican party should come into power and reduce taxes fifty per cent. Would not that program be constructive?"

Such a questioner would do well to observe that while Republican Congressmen are quick to demand cuts in expenditures for the New Deal, they are quick to vote increased appropriations for a gigantic navy. But suppose, for the sake of argument, that a fifty per cent cut in federal taxes were actually effected by the Republicans, or by any other party! *The resulting stimulus to capital investment would infallibly (as in the period before 1929) promote inflation of land values and ground rents all over the country, thus burdening industry with liabilities equal to, or exceeding, the tax reduction; and the result would be another "crash."*

No policy will now give relief except one which goes to the root of our economic problem, reversing our lopsided, aristocratic, European-made system of taxation by transferring fiscal burdens from productive capital and merchandise to the ground rentals of occupied sites and to the value of unused land. This policy would not only encourage private enterprise, the most precious economic force in human society; but it would create a growing demand for labor, a consequent reduction in "relief," an increase in wages and purchasing power; *while at the same time, it would call into existence an immensely greater structure of industry and property which would more equitably bear the expenses of government. There is no other way out of our present confusion.*

ANYONE who really fears a revolution in America ought to re-read Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," one of the great social documents of all time. . . . I first read "Progress and Poverty" thirty years ago. . . . In all these years I have never known his premises to be shaken in the least.

—KATHLEEN NORRIS.

PEOPLE do not argue with the teaching of George; they simply do not know it. The teaching of George is irresistibly convincing in its simplicity and clearness. **He who becomes acquainted with it cannot but agree.**

—LEO TOLSTOY.

## Bummer and Lazarus

By JOS. W. FOLEY

**T**HOUGH this age has been rightly called "The Age of Discovery," it so very seldom happens that the man in the street enters the ranks of the discoverer that the finding of even a small "nugget" gives a pleasing sensation of triumph. When the discovery is associated with Henry George the pleasure is increased; and the increase is greater when it throws light on some statement of his.

In Chapter V of the First Book of "The Science of Political Economy," Henry George writes:

"'Bummer' and his client 'Lazarus' were as well known as any two-legged San Franciscan some thirty-five or forty years ago, and until their skins had been affectionately stuffed, they were 'deadheads' at free lunches, in public conveyances and at public functions."

I suppose many readers, like myself, have often wondered who these two animals were. Not that their identification would add one iota to the sum of human happiness, or assist in the study of Political Economy; but the passage quoted above becomes intensified by knowing something about the animals themselves. And behind the animals lies a moving story of kindness.

Some ten years before Henry George reached San Francisco, another wanderer had landed there. His name was Joshua Abraham Norton, and he was an English Jew. He was about thirty years old, and his dress and bearing marked him out as being somewhat eccentric. This did not prevent him from prospering, for within a few months he was the occupant of a large building on one of the main streets, and advertised himself as "J. A. Norton, Merchant."

In less than five years this original building had increased fourfold, and Norton had become the owner of several others. For him, there was no need to run around seeking odd jobs at typesetting; for him no expeditions to Oregon or the Frazer River, chasing elusive gold and coming back "dead broke"; for him no going out to borrow five dollars from the first man he met.

Norton was indeed a "forty-niner," and he had the "forty-niner's" luck. "His name was writ in the list of 'our substantial citizens'; he had the courtship of men and the flattery of women"; but I doubt if he had "the best pew in the church and the personal regard of the eloquent clergymen."

Then by one swift stroke of fortune came disaster. The fire of 1853 almost blotted out the city. All Norton's fortune went up in flames, and heaps of ashes marked the places where but yesterday stood his substantial shops.

Stunned by the blow, he wandered aimlessly around, making no attempt to retrieve his losses; and when his friends, fearing suicide, offered their help, he did not

even answer, but walked away dazed with grief.

For a time he disappeared; and we can only picture some kindly soul looking after his wants and nursing him back to something like sanity. But when he reappeared he had raised himself to royalty! He was "Emperor of the United States of America" with the title "Norton the First." He announced that this honor had been conferred upon him by the state legislature, and later on, he added "Protector of Mexico."

It was well for the "Emperor" that he lived in such a backward age; for had he issued his proclamation today, a jury of "scientists" would have sat on him and discovered that he had a "split" mind, or that his hormones were not behaving themselves, and his royal palace would have been a lunatic asylum. But in those days he was accepted as one of God's afflicted, and treated as such.

His next proclamation declared that his subjects must pay taxes for the royal upkeep; and this was followed by "demand notes," which he served himself, acting as his own collector, and giving receipts bearing the royal seal. Fortunately for the San Franciscans, there was no national debt, and his entourage consisted of two collie dogs "Bummer" and "Lazarus," who followed him everywhere.

His "demands" were never excessive, generally two or three dollars, and when they were not met, which was very seldom, he threatened to "levy attachment," which soon brought in the cash.

Soon he came to be regarded as a fixture, and for nearly thirty years his claims were seldom disputed. As Henry George says, he and his dogs "were deadheads at free lunches, in public conveyances and at public functions."

On one occasion, travelling by train, he entered the dining-car and demanded a meal appropriate for Royalty. The steward, not recognizing his royal visitor, whose shabby clothes did not suggest a royal exchequer, took no notice of him; whereupon the steward was royally berated, and the rail oad company was threatened with the loss o its franchise.

It was only after some of the passengers had told the steward to fill the order and present the bill to them, and the steward had tendered a profuse apology, that the royal indignation subsided. Shortly after this the railroad company sent the "Emperor" a pass available on any of its trains and dining-cars.

"We, Norton I, Dei Gratia Emperor of the United States of America and Protector of Mexico, do command that the steamship company for denying us a free passage to Sacramento be blocked on the river by the revenue cutter 'Shubric' till the rebels surrender."

This was a proclamation issued after a steamboat captain, unaware that he was carrying royalty, demanded payment of Norton's fare. Again his "Majesty" was acknowledged,

and he received a life-pass on all the company's boats.

The thought arises, was this revenue cutter, "Shubric," the same ship as that which brought George to California? It is very likely; for in one of his letters he says: "The Light-House steamer 'Shubric' will sail in a couple of weeks for California, where she is to be employed;" and there is a description of her in "The Life of Henry George" which makes it certain. "In addition to her regular duties of supplying lighthouses and maintaining the buoyage along the West coast, she was intended to give protection to government property along the seashore of Oregon and Washington from the depredations of Indian tribes, and was armed with six brass guns and a novel contrivance for squirting scalding water on the redskins when at close quarters."

Norton the First was "dear cousin" to Victoria of England and Francis Joseph of Austria, but scorned to hold converse with that upstart Napoleon III, and when the latter was rightly beaten by Norton's "dear cousin," the King of Prussia, San Francisco was placarded with a proclamation of rejoicing.

He did not disdain to take an interest in local politics, notwithstanding his connections with Europe's monarchs, and for twenty years seldom missed a session of the legislature, having his own special chair in the senate house. And when Grant was seeking nomination for president for the third time, the "Emperor" sent him a personal telegram commanding him to withdraw.

In 1868 Norton suffered his second great loss, for in that year died Bummer and Lazarus, and the Emperor was bereft of his court.

George refers to the dogs as "Bummer" and his *client* "Lazarus," and at first one is puzzled by the expression. But when one remembers the exactitude of George's language the difficulty disappears. For instance, many readers of "Progress and Poverty" are disturbed when they read "it is only necessary to *confiscate* rent," for there seems to be something unjust in the word "confiscate." But when its real meaning is shown to be "to put into the public treasury" the injustice vanishes. Again, in "The Science of Political Economy," he says "the confusions as to value which in the minds of the students of the scholastic economy have *perplexed the idea* of wealth." We are accustomed to thinking of the *mind* being perplexed; but when we discover that the word means "to make difficult to be understood," we realize George's grasp of the English language. And so with the word "client," which originally meant a dependent, or a follower; we can picture "Lazarus" following the lead of the more active or intelligent, or perhaps older, "Bummer".

But whichever it may have been, their funeral was attended by a "concourse of San Franciscans on foot and in carriage," and as George says "their skins were affectionately stuffed," and, it may be, preserved to this day in a public museum.

Their loss however, did not deter the "Emperor" from performing his duties, and he continued issuing proclamations till 1879 when at the close of that year his "subjects" were called upon to offer prayers of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the blessings of the year that was closing!

Did he know? Could he have numbered those blessings? Had he heard of a book which had been brought to birth only a few months before? We can picture Henry George reading the placard, and fervently responding to its call.

But the American Empire was nearing its close, for Norton died on the 8th of January, 1880, after an illness of only a week. His passing might have been that of an orthodox Emperor, for the newspapers published long accounts of his life, and "more than 10,000 people, from working men to millionaires, and including over 2,000 women and children, followed his corpse to the Masonic Cemetery." This was no mere theatrical spectacle, but their sorrow was sincere and genuine; and the Pacific Union Club bore the whole expense.

Food for reflection; and questions many. But only one will suffice. George has made the dogs immortal, but what of the man?

Here, one would think, is a character which he might have used to illustrate many of his points; but unless it is in some of George's earlier and less known writings, Norton is not mentioned.

It is quite possible that there are still living, "old-timers" who can remember both Norton and George, and may be able to say if George ever spoke of the "Emperor." But whether or no, linking the two together has been an interesting and delightful task.

## On Masks

THE Brooklyn Museum has been exhibiting a remarkable collection of masks of all types and races. The exhibition was labelled, "Masks—Barbaric and Civilized." One might see the witch-doctor masks of the African Negro, theatrical masks of the Orient, ceremonial masks of the American Indian.

Interesting is the fact that one present-day mask of the "civilized" world is—a gas-mask.

That reminds us of Thomas Hardy's verse:

"Peace upon earth!" was said. We sing it,  
And pay a million priests to bring it.  
After two thousand years of mass  
We've got as far as poison gas.

One of the reasons we have to don gas-masks today may be that our economists, and leaders in high places are wearing masks similar to the primitive witch-doctor masks.

One word in defense of the witch-doctor—there was no one to tell him better.

# Signs of Progress

## GEORGEIST ACTIVITIES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

### Henry George School of Social Science

AT the headquarters of the School, at 30 East 29th Street, New York City, a step has been taken which ranks with the two or three major events in the history of the School.

In 1933, the School acquired its own headquarters. In 1938 it moved to a large building of five stories. Only the first three floors could be used. Now, in 1940, the building is to be completed and the top floors are to be used and filled with students.

Mr. and Mrs. Francis Neilson have generously offered to donate one-third of the expense of equipping these upper floors, providing the other two-thirds can be raised in contributions. The response so far has been heartening.

When the building is completed, it will consist of four large floors of classes, filled with students every day, and in addition, there will be offices, library, students' meeting room and cafeteria. The School is certainly the answer to what Harry Gunnison Brown calls "the void in college curricula."

The building is expected to be completed by the Fall, for classes beginning in October. In the meanwhile, Spring classes open at the School the week of February 5. An enrollment of 1,500 has already been reported, and more are expected. Especially encouraging has been the response of high-school students, to whom particular attention is now being paid.

Another interesting development is worthy of notice. Secretary Teresa McCarthy is now engaged in traveling to the various extensions of the School in different cities, to help build them up, and establish firmer contact with headquarters.

The vacancy thus created has been filled by Edwin Ross, Jr., of Arden, Delaware, who is now functioning as assistant to the Director. Mr. Ross has had a Georgeist background from infancy, and is fully equipped in his own right to become the Director's assistant. His uncle was Will Ross, who did yeoman service in the Californian "Great Adventure" campaign. The new assistant was formerly an actor in Walter Hampden's troupe. He was also one of the first speakers at the School in 1932.

The Sunday forums continue to attract new people to the School. At the one held on January 21, there was a debate between Charles Abrams and Alexander Goldfinger on the question, "Can public housing eliminate the slum problem?" Mr. Abrams, who took the affirmative, is a lecturer at the New School for Social Research,

consultant for the United States Housing Authority, and author of the recent book, "Revolution in Land." Mr. Goldfinger, who took the negative, is a lawyer and an instructor in the Henry George School, Newark, N. J., extension.

### COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

More than seven hundred graduates received their diplomas on Tuesday evening, January 30, 1940. The affair was held in the Auditorium of the Engineering Societies Building in New York City. John B. English, a former graduate and now an instructor at the School, presided.

The principal address was delivered by Grover C. Loud, who was introduced as a Harvard graduate, an officer in the American Army during the World War, a former instructor in various American Universities, a former Professor of English Literature, and now on the editorial staff of the *New York Times*. Mr. Loud related a number of his experiences while on the faculties of recognized institutions of higher education and was convinced more than ever that nowhere can a student attain the mastery of the science of political economy as extensively and completely, as at the courses given by the Henry George School.

Jules Guedalia, a "Wall Street man," who originally came to the School to scoff and remained to study and become an instructor, delivered a scholarly address. He stressed the importance of the recognition of equality in contradistinction to the present chaotic monopolistic control as exercised by a minority.

Frank Chodorov, director of the School, also spoke. He took for his theme, "Maintaining our Amateur Standing." He pointed out the importance of directing the work solely from the standpoint of an institution of learning. He declared that the phenomenal growth and future hope for expansion is solely dependent upon a continuation of this policy.

Several of the graduates were called upon to speak, and all of them testified to the revolution in thought they underwent upon studying at the School, and all of them professed that they were now dedicated to the cause of economic enlightenment.

The "old-timers" who were present at the meeting were quite impressed. One of them remarked, "What a sight this is to behold! We are witnessing a revitalization of the noblest cause yet evolved to benefit mankind."

## SOCIETY FOR LONG ISLAND GEORGEISTS

The fifth Reunion Dinner-Talk-Fest of the Society was held January 4, at Jamaica, Long Island. About one hundred attended, including teachers, new and old graduates, and friends. Among the speakers were Gilbert M. Tucker, author of "The Path to Prosperity," who spoke on the difference between New Deal and Natural Law; Robert Clancy, who told the group about Oscar H. Geiger, Founder of the Henry George School, and about the ideas and efforts behind the educational movement; and Senor Rogelio Casas Cadilla of Spain, former editor of *La Reforma Sociale*, who prepared an address on the economy of Spain, which was read by Mr. C. O. Steele. (The address appears elsewhere in this issue.) Senor Casas also informed the group that the Georgeists in Spain are left unmolested by both Fascists and Communists. As long as they keep to their work of education, they may influence both sides, without being oppressed by either.

Dr. S. A. Schneidman, of the Society, has done much to build up the Long Island extension of the School. Following is a list of classes, with their opening dates, being held in Long Island:

Thursday, Feb. 1, 7:45 P. M., Sewanhakee High School, Floral Park.

Friday, February 2, 8 P. M., Flushing Y. M. C. A., Flushing.

Monday, February 5, 7:45 P. M., Andrew Jackson High School, St. Albans.

Tuesday, February 6, 8 P. M., Public School No. 109, Queens Village.

Wednesday, February 7, 7:45 P. M., Jamaica High School, Jamaica.

Wednesday, February 7, 8 P. M., Highland Park Y. M. C. A., Brooklyn.

## CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

The Spring term of the Henry George School in Chicago opens with an imposing list of classes, both in the fundamental course in "Progress and Poverty," and in the advanced courses. Some of these courses are held at the Chicago headquarters, 139 North Clark Street, and many are held throughout the city and suburbs, in libraries, churches, schools and community houses.

## BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

Through the efforts of Grace Johnston, Helen Denbigh, and the Henry George Fellowship of Berkeley, classes are being conducted in two Y. M. C. A.'s, three high schools and one community house, beginning the week of February 12.

## Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

## WINTER REPORT BY V. G. PETERSON

ALASKAN PIONEER—The first Alaskan magazine devoted to the Philosophy of Freedom, has made its debut. *Frontier*, edited and published by Jim Busey, came from the press on January 22.

Last issue we told you about this ambitious young man who, through his magazine, hopes to mould the thoughts and actions of his countrymen. In a letter received today Mr. Busey says, "*Frontier* is bigger and better than originally expected. It has thirty-two pages, and although this first number appears on newsprint, I expect to get out the next on book paper and in such attractive form as to put us right up with the rest of them." Soon Mr. Busey will run, serially, a condensed version of "Progress and Poverty." Jim Busey deserves our assistance. He needs editorial material, articles, and, yes, a little financial help would not be amiss. Address your letters care of this Foundation or send them direct to Independence, Wasilla, Alaska. Let's pull together on this.

GEORGEIST NOEL—Our Christmas campaign was successful. Several hundred books, a thousand pamphlets and eight-hundred-and-fifty calendars were distributed during the holiday season. The calendar, an innovation, proved popular. From all over the country letters of commendation have poured in. One man, sending us a check to cover his purchase, said that he esteemed it a privilege to be able to purchase this handsome and effective piece of propaganda. "It should gladden the heart of every true Georgeist," he said, "to see this calendar on the wall." In homes and offices, libraries and other public buildings, these are hanging, to remain, we hope, throughout the whole of 1940.

NEW LITERATURE—During February and on through March and April, we expect to spend considerable time and money in the circularizing of a large group of high school teachers. Special material has been prepared for distribution to this important group and through our efforts we hope to influence the manner in which they will, in future, teach economics to Young America.

A new edition of "An Appreciation of Henry George," by John Dewey, has just come from our press. This beautiful tribute, which contains the often quoted passage, "It would require less than the fingers of the two hands to enumerate those who from Plato down rank with Henry George," appears now in convenient and attractive folder form. Single copies are two cents each. A dollar, because of decreased shipping costs, will purchase seventy-five.

"Why Penalize Building," a report of a special committee headed by W. R. B. Willcox, to the American Institute of Architects, is again available. And what



will be good news to those who like to purchase this effective pamphlet in quantities, is that the present lot runs considerably cheaper than the last. Single copies are five cents. A dollar will purchase twenty-five.

**OUR BRITISH BROTHERS**—From England we have succeeded in importing a small quantity of Leo Tolstoy's "A Great Iniquity." Twenty-nine pages, this booklet which sells at five cents, provides an hour or more of most enjoyable reading.

Also from London comes another five cent pamphlet, "Scotland and Scotsmen," an address which Henry George delivered in the City Hall of Glasgow, February, 1884.

Speaking of London, for the benefit of those who have wondered how our English workers fare during these trying days of war, we repeat here a portion of a recent letter from Mr. Arthur Madsen. He says, "We keep busy enough, rather surprisingly so, considering the circumstances. Instead of going, however, to the expense of curtaining our fifteen very large windows, we stop work during the winter at four in the afternoon and try to make compensation by all being here promptly at nine in the morning. The shorter hours mean that much work has to be taken home of an evening and for week-end attention."

**FAME AND HENRY GEORGE**—This year a group of one-hundred-and-fourteen prominent citizens will choose the names of eighteen famous persons for inscription in the Hall of Fame. The beautiful and historic "Hall" is an open air colonnade more than six hundred feet long and ten feet wide, situated on the campus of New York University, overlooking the majestic Palisades and the Hudson River. Carved in the stone, as exponents of its object and scope, are the following words:

THE HALL OF FAME  
FOR GREAT AMERICANS  
BY WEALTH OF THOUGHT  
OR ELSE BY MIGHTY DEED  
THEY SERVED MANKIND  
IN NOBLE CHARACTER  
IN WORLD-WIDE GOOD  
THEY LIVE FOREVER MORE

In 1935, when the last election was held, Henry George received fifty-seven votes and comes up automatically as a candidate now. The Foundation will again undertake the campaign for his election. Such names as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Daniel Webster, Benjamin Franklin, Ralph Waldo Emerson, are already there. It is fitting that the name of Henry George should join this distinguished company.

## Manhattan Single Tax Club

**F**OLLOWING are extracts from President Charles H. Ingersoll's report on the annual meeting of the Club in December, 1939:

"Besides the election of officers and directors for the ensuing year, the following was voted:—that the name of the Club be changed to *The National Single Tax Association* or *The Single Tax Society of America*, or some similar name. Or, as an alternative, the formation of a subsidiary of this Club with such a name. The object is to broaden the scope of the Club, without weakening its local influence. In 1931 this question was voted on affirmatively, but action was not taken, due to President James R. Brown's illness.

"The Manhattan Single Tax Club was organized in 1896 by Henry George and his intimate friends. Its Presidents have been, so far as recorded: Robert Schalkenbach, 1896-8; Samuel Seabury, 1899; William B. McCracken, 1900; John S. Crosby, 1903; Frederic C. Leubuscher; John T. McRoy; James R. Brown, 1915-31; O. K. Dorn, 1931; Walter Fairchild, 1932; Charles H. Ingersoll, 1933 to date. The names of A. J. Steers, Ben Doblin, Alfred Bishop Mason and Lawson Purdy are yet to be placed in the record.

"There has been much anti-organization talk recently which this Club disapproves. Single Taxers are not obsessed with organization or politics, but they know of no other way of bringing their program to fruition without employing both. Teaching itself is organization, and unless done so in methodical organized ways, is ineffective. So the Club asks for the renewal of the generous and democratic support given during its whole notable career of nearly half a century."

Mr. Ingersoll continues his radio broadcasting activities. Following are a few of his pithy comments over the air:

**CHAMBERLAIN SAYS MORE THAN HIS PRAYERS.** HE SAYS THAT two-thirds of the people of England have small incomes. I'll say they have. It would surprise him to know (if he doesn't) just how small. As a reason for untaxing their necessities, he puts it very mildly. My guess is that 90 per cent of the 47,000,000 people of England have to watch closely their buying, and that it is limited to their current income; so that, with the kind of taxes England (and every other country) has, they buy only half what they need and want, which accounts for the millions of unemployed.

**ONE OF THE MEANEST TRICKS OF GOVERNMENT, PLAYED ON THE** People of New York, is the abolishing of push carts—and the hypocrisy of building big markets with consumer-taxes. This plays the landlord's game and—as always, exploits the mass consumer and the small merchant. Push carts are not aristocratic or lovely; but they sell stuff cheap, and they provide an easy way to get into business. *But they don't pay rent.*

**WE NEVER EXPECTED TO SEE THE U. S. A. CONDUCTING A WAR** for free trade against her forty-eight states. The U. S. A. is itself committed to the very opposite principle—or fallacy—that of protection. Yet when Uncle Sam sees his children setting up trade barriers between the different units of his happy family, his sense of justice, as well as his traditional common sense, revolts. The federal government has launched a campaign in the name of sound economics against states that have erected "artificially-created trade barriers" imposed to "enrich individual state coffers." This is the exact language of the free trade school of economists, whose wise counsel has for fifty years been disregarded while the international tariff wall has built up our monopoly system.

## Great Britain

British Georgeists continue their activities *quand m'ême*. The January issue of *Land and Liberty*, English Georgeist paper, reports the sustained educational and lecture work of the United Committee, the English League and other organizations.

The following advertisement appeared in a Welsh newspaper:

### STUDY ECONOMICS AT HOME DURING THE "BLACKOUT"

A Free Correspondence Course is offered to you. Your only expense apart from your postage will be 1 shilling for the text-book, "Progress and Poverty," by Henry George.

For full particulars, apply

HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

34 Knightrider Street, London, E. C. 4

Thus, there will be *one* great light, at least, continuing to shine, despite blackouts. Of course, the war has to some extent created difficulties for the Georgeist movement in Britain, but it is carrying on. And when there is no longer need for blackouts, it will still be in the field. Frederick Verinder, in reporting on the English League, quotes one of the younger members: "As soon as I am demobilized, I shall be ready for the fray in a combat far more fundamental—that of 'land restoration.'"

## Denmark

We have received the following letter from Denmark:

"We young Georgeists here in Denmark would like to found a better link of connection between young Georgeists in all countries in the whole world.

"We should be very glad if you could place in your paper a notice that young Georgeists in other countries want to correspond with American Georgeists, and that if they turn to me, I will try to find a correspondent for them in another country.

"Would you please ask your young readers to state in which language they want to correspond: English, German, French or Esperanto.

"Yours truly,

"Svend E. Hansen."

The Danish organization of young Georgeists is the Justice Youth Association, and the man to contact is Svend E. Hansen, Vangedevej 2, Gentofte, Denmark.

This is an encouraging step in the right direction.

The Georgeist movement is world-wide, and the more it is unified, and the more interactions are established, the more progress it will make. We urge our readers to begin such a correspondence as is suggested by Mr. Hansen.

## Australia

With the idea that the pen is mightier than the sword, a group of Australian Georgeists propose the formation

of a Liberty Readers' Book Club, the aim of which is to stimulate the printing and reading of works on the Georgeist philosophy. We quote from the December, 1939, issue of *The Standard*, Georgeist paper printed at Sydney, Australia:

"What is a Book Club? It is a community of persons actuated by common aims, who undertake to purchase monthly one book at a low cost devoted to the support, or written by a supporter of those common aims. There is no subscription; cash on delivery of each book. The books may cover matters of wide interest which seem to lie beyond the immediate scope of Georgeian interest, but which in reality are shown to be the result of private ownership of ground-rent and the like. The Book Club thus becomes an important factor in propaganda, and, wisely used, must greatly increase the influence of Georgeism amongst people who would otherwise take no direct interest in it. The Book Club performs two particular services:

"(1) It guarantees a large circulation of certain books before publication, and thus enables a publishing house to sell, at a low price, books that are usually very expensive.

"(2) It ensures that worth while books supporting the common aim (Georgeism) are widely read and discussed. . . .

"The Great Reservoir of Economic Truth, the stored wisdom of Georgeian philosophy, is like the water which has to be reticulated to the desert lands. It won't flow there of its own volition, or if it goes uncontrolled, it will just seep away without great benefit resulting, or may even start up the rank growth of noxious weeds. This is what has happened to a great deal of Georgeian teaching, but partly understood in ill-prepared minds, which become the prey of socialist and communist teaching claiming to be more advanced.

"The Community is athirst for information, and will imbibe any kind of matter made sufficiently attractive. Probably about ten per centum of the people will take interest in some form of political propaganda, and it is amongst this section that we have to find individuals who will become receptive and transmitting points for Georgeism. . . .

"The Georgeian interpretation of current affairs can only be presented today in a desultory manner, because the average publisher cannot risk his money on a Georgeian book owing to lack of support. The Movement can and must assist Georgeian authors who now have little chance of presenting major works to the world and are mainly confined to pamphlets and leaflets. As valuable as are these smaller publications, they cannot have the lasting effect upon the minds of readers, especially of those whom we desire most to win to our Movement. The way to assist the Georgeian author is to assure success for the sale of his books so that the publisher won't be left with unsold copies on his hands. This can be accomplished by the L. R. B. C.

"Scores of titles of world interest suggest them-

selves upon reflection. There are innumerable matters of deep interest about which known Georgians of ability can write in a way never before attempted, i.e., presenting the facts before the enlightening background of a Georgian philosophy, more by suggestion than by direct propaganda for Georgeism, revealing to what degree the land problem, as we understand it, is the father of most of the folly and distress to which our poor is heir. . . .

"The foregoing suggests that dynamic authors, with special knowledge and something new to say, would receive encouragement to present the Georgian viewpoint. The History of Mankind needs re-writing from that viewpoint in order that the great mass of the people shall be permeated with the Georgian philosophy. There will be plenty of work for the men of the New Pen-Age to do, and still more for the readers. . . .

"Thus, by scientific method, and armed with modern and efficient weapons (including the spiritual equipment of the Georgian philosophy) can be created the—

"New Democracy, resting upon the enlightenment of large masses of people, sustained by the eternal vigilance of an enlightened and active minority, whose purpose is not to stir up discontent or strife and strikes, but to enlighten those about them. Movements of a small group of men have done much towards saving civilization in the past, and such Movements as this Liberty Readers' Book Club, may well become the means of saving our civilization."

### South Africa

At Johannesburg, there is at work a Georgeist organization, called the Farmers' and Workers' Party. The chairman is F. A. W. Lucas, and the secretary is Mather Smith. The official organ, *The Free People*, tells us something of the aims of the Party:

"In February, 1936, four men, and three of them very poor men, seeing that none of the existing political Parties had any intention of tackling the root causes of the ever increasing poverty in our land, decided to start a new political party on their own. Since then, the Gospel of Deliverance has been preached right through South Africa, and has been accepted by many."

The Party leaders are at present active in spreading economic truth to the masses of unemployed that collect at the Labor Bureau in Johannesburg, looking for jobs. Mr. Lucas points out to them the absurdity of capable men having to parade up and down with placards marked "We Want Work" (and "Ons Vra Werk"), and he urges them to demand the cure for unemployment as presented by the Farmers' and Workers' Party—which is, of course, the Georgeist reform. The Party leaders report that their appeals are well received.

## An Appeal for Action

By HENRY J. FOLEY

I BELIEVE that the time is ripe for the formation of a society to work toward placing the principles of Henry George on the statute books. Not that we can hope to change the laws this year or next, but to work intelligently and unitedly and everlastingly until the law is changed, whether it be in ten years or a hundred. The purpose is to capture and put to work the energies which have no outlet now except in hopes and prayers, and in describing to one another the beauties of the Single Tax. The grains of powder which now give us interesting fireworks displays could be massed in a cannon which would batter down the walls of monopoly and privilege.

The aim of the society:

1. To spread the simple doctrine that rent is the creation of society, and that the appropriation of rent by individuals, and the resulting taxation, are a double form of robbery.

2. To coordinate the efforts of Single Taxers who are now unacquainted with one another, and to get concerted action which will (ultimately) bring our desires to the attention of legislatures, and thus bring Single Tax out into the open and make it a live issue.

3. To enlist in the cause the dissatisfactions of those who do not understand the land question nor the rent question, but who are complaining bitterly of the government restrictions and government confiscations which we know are the results of the present land system; the ten millions out of work and helpless, the industrialists hampered with a thousand forms of taxes, with "5,000 laws and 17,000 regulations," and pressure groups organized to save themselves from government at the expense of other groups.

The only thing which will bring in the Single Tax is the placing of a law on the statute books, abolishing taxes, and decreeing that all ground-rent shall be collected for the public revenue. This change in the law will not be made until the people demand it, and they will not demand it until they understand that the private appropriation of land rent by individuals is legalized robbery, making prosperity impossible.

Single Taxers have spun the doctrine through all the mazes of economics and philosophy and ethics and religion. Not that we have settled the questions. We still dispute on the fine points of interest, the exact definition of rent, whether rent enters into price, and a dozen other questions, while "all this poor world really needs" is the knowledge that the legalized theft of the rent is the cause of its miseries.

These questions are fine things for the education of teachers, and in books for the intellectually inclined, but they should be left to these fields, and the programme of Single Taxers should be rigidly held to the collection of rent for public expenses. I believe that Single Taxers should unite upon this one fundamental. The man who believes in this is a Single Taxer no matter how he regards any other topic on earth, and he should be a member of the proposed society.

This fundamental fact is simple enough to be understood by every man who has to pay taxes on his house, on his income, and on his cigarettes. It should get the ready assent of every one except the men who make a living by keeping the world out of work, and they are a negligible minority at the polls. But we shall have to keep the programme as simple as that. At the same time, it is broad enough to take in every believer in the doctrines of Henry George, and it offers a field of action wide enough to enlist all the energies of all Single Taxers regardless of their ideas on the moot questions which have divided them and distracted them, and rendered them impotent.

An organization based upon the demand for equal liberty, and the restrictions of the powers of government to protecting those liberties, should be able to secure the enthusiastic approval of the vast majority

**A Free Copy of LAND AND FREEDOM  
is an invitation to become a subscriber.**

of American citizens. *And it would automatically include the Single Tax as its first objective.*

There is nothing in the proposed society to militate against the activities of any other Single Tax organization such as the Henry George School. There is more work awaiting us than all the societies together can accomplish, and we can cooperate with increased efficiency and better results for all. Recruits to this society will be interested in the schools which can give them a deeper insight, and all Single Taxers will find in the society the machinery by which they can put their enthusiasm to work. There is no good reason why any Single Taxer should not be a member of the society.

I suggest that Single Taxers solicit their friends to join, and thus start by individual work. When our numbers are sufficient we can collect the funds necessary for mass meetings, press campaigns, radio, and lectures to such groups as manufacturers' associations, merchants, and civic groups. A good speaker might even hope to induce some of these groups to join in a body, as the only way in which they could ever hope to secure the benefits for which they have come together.

The reader is asked to suggest a name for the society, a name which will not label us as a brand of land reformers or tax reformers, but which will attract those who still believe in human liberty and in the right of men to live their own lives and to own what they have worked for.

I should be glad to hear from those who feel that there is room for such a society, and who would help in forming it.\*

\* Mr. Foley's address is 88-25 173d Street, Jamaica, L. I., N. Y.

## Single Tax—A Misnomer

BY GEORGE C. WINNE

WHAT is the goal of the followers of Henry George? It is to spread his gospel of abolishing taxes in order to create equal opportunity. Do the words "Single Tax" suggest such an inspiring message? What greater virtue has a Single Tax over the present system of multiple taxes? Does not the thought of a tax produce resentment, a thing to be avoided, shunned, curtailed or reduced? It is an odious thing. Does the term "Single Tax" give a true description of a great social advance for equal opportunity, a great step forward, to eliminate undeserved poverty, from which flow so many social ills? How can those who are uninformed feel an inspirational impulse when we suggest a Single Tax? To many, a Single Tax suggests another fiscal innovation, which may be heavier and more burdensome than a diversified form of taxation.

Can we say the community-made rental value is a tax? If I earn a certain compensation, can it be considered a tax? If a group of people, which we may choose to call a "community" earn a certain compensation from one member of the community, can it be considered a tax? A person who has paid a rental for occupying a certain plot of land is only paying that rental because other persons also desire the opportunity to occupy the same plot of ground. If one or more persons would not compete for the privilege of occupying a certain plot of ground, it would not have a rental value. It is only the presence of people competing for that privilege that will give the land a rental value.

We may define a tax as "a charge or pecuniary burden laid upon persons or property for public purposes; a forced contribution of wealth to meet the public needs of government" That which we strive for is foreign to that purpose. We are not endeavoring to meet the needs of the government. We are endeavoring to meet the needs of the individual. The desire of the individual is to have equal opportunity.

We do not suggest making a forced contribution. Why then should we place our philosophy in an improper classification? If it is not a tax, why should we call it a tax? Our doctrine has

none of the characteristics of a tax. Our principle is to abolish taxes, retaining not even a Single Tax.

Taking the full community-made rental value for community purposes is not an idealistic theory, but a realization of a means whereby an equal opportunity may be granted to man to use natural resources for the satisfaction of his desires. In order for man to satisfy his desires he will be obliged to apply his mental and physical labor to reduce a certain portion of natural resources to possession or to further advance that which someone has reduced to possession. What does he have to pay for the privilege of reducing a certain portion of nature's resources to possession? Only that which he individually has not created, but which he has collectively created with other men. The presence of a society of men has created markets and exchanges, not any individual man. The competitive rental-value of the use of a certain plot of ground may be readily determined by the mere competition for the privilege to use it.

So let us strive for the abolition of all taxes. It sounds good. It has a sales appeal. It will gain adherents. It is a truer characterization of that for which we strive.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### FINANCING ECONOMIC SECURITY IN THE UNITED STATES

BY WILLIAM WITHERS

Columbia University Press, New York City. 210 pp. Price \$2.75.

This volume, by an Economics Professor at Queens College, attempts to survey the problem of economic security in the United States. Its publication could be justified only if it were written with special skill (and it is), with fresh intelligence, and with a sound interpretation of the problem of relief.

In a circular accompanying the book, we learn that another Assistant Professor of Economics, at Columbia University, considers the book "illuminating," and believes that the author "carries his erudition lightly and has written a refreshingly clear and lucid book."

As a factual account of the sorry mess called Federal Relief, Professor Withers treats the subject with reasonable thoroughness. As a study of the causes and cure of the problem, the book is barren and of little value. This is particularly true because of the inexcusable failure of Professor Withers to enlighten his readers on the basic principles of taxation and the profound influence they exert on the problem of unemployment and insecurity. The question arises: can we expect a Professor of Political Economy to give us light, when he himself is in darkness?

Cautiously, he informs us that unemployment is the main cause of economic insecurity. He writes (p. 4):

"In the depths of the depression in the early thirties, probably from fourteen to seventeen million Americans, about one-third of the working population, were unemployed. Even in 1937, when business conditions had markedly improved, unemployment was still estimated at from seven to nine million."

This reviewer would pause here to make a few important observations. For instance, how has the Federal Government attempted to cope with a problem of such magnitude? Has it sought to ascertain the *cause* of unemployment? Has it any conception of what unemployment really is? Has it ever considered why the Pilgrims who landed here in 1620 never suffered such a problem? Or why savages, today, in darkest Africa know no such problem?

The Federal Government has spent over twenty-five billion dollars since 1930 in its vain efforts to solve the problem.

With what results?

Along with the unsolved employment problem, we are now suffering:

- (a) An unprecedented tax burden.
- (b) The heaviest national debt in our history.
- (c) Lack of confidence on the part of the investing public.
- (d) Continuous antagonism between government and business.

It has not dawned on our politicians, and professors of political economy, that taxation, by robbing Peter to give to Paul, never can solve the unemployment problem. If it has, they have given no indication of that fact.

Today, taxes absorb one-fifth of our entire national income! That means that every year, more than 20 per cent of the earnings of the American people are being seized by their government. A recent economic survey showed that as a result of stupid relief measures and heavy taxation, the United States lagged near the end among twenty-three nations trying to recover from the depression of the past ten years.

With so little inducement to work and produce (because the government counts itself in as your partner when you succeed, and forgets all about you when you fail) is it any wonder that business has been steadily folding up and withering away, and the very problem of unemployment relief intensified?

What does Professor Withers suggest for this terrible condition? *More taxes!* Yes, dear reader, *more taxes.* By a parity of reasoning may we not fairly assume that he would attempt to cure an opium addict by prescribing more opium?

But let us quote Professor Withers (page 97):

"Under ideal tax systems five billions more of state and of local revenue than were obtained in prosperous years might be secured. It was pointed out earlier that the Federal income-tax system might be improved by broadening the base of the income tax. One or two billion dollars of additional revenue might be secured in this way. Millions might be obtained from reductions in evasions, avoidance, exemption, and unreasonable delinquency. . . . The reasoning outlined above leads to the conclusion that Americans are not over-taxed, and that instead, they are badly in need of tax reform. . . ."

"If the citizens of nations which resemble the United States in wealth and in economic development are paying higher taxes than Americans pay, it is plausible to conclude that American taxes are not too high. If the taxes in other countries are not forcing a crisis in capitalism, it may be that the American economic system could stand higher levies."

This from our colleges and universities! No wonder the man in the street has lost faith in professors of political economy. Such balderdash has compelled producers, strangled by steadily mounting taxation to look elsewhere for an understanding and solution of the problem.

We looked to our colleges for bread, and they offered us a stone.

B. W. BURGER.

#### A CLASSIC REMODELLED

"Progress and Poverty," by Henry George. Rearranged and abridged for modern readers by Harry Gunnison Brown. Henry George School of Social Science. New York, 1940, 232 pp. 25 cents.

Professor Brown in this edition has not so much abridged the whole book as he has deleted chapters and paragraphs which he considers unnecessary for the reader of the nineteen forties. The latter part of "Progress and Poverty" is permitted to stand, but the first part—the sections on the wages-fund theory, the Malthusian theory and the laws of distribution—is cut down quite considerably. Brown's purpose in this was to present, in George's own words, a smooth-flowing argument, suitable for the modern reader, without too much of the difficult or obsolete matter that would tend to make the reader stop and figure it out.

In his prefatory remarks Professor Brown says: "It is not unlikely that numerous intending readers have so lost their interest, before finishing these chapters, that they have thrown aside the book

and never examined at all those analyses for which it is most notable and in which, had their patience lasted only a little longer, they would have been keenly interested. For no other writer, probably, has ever written so appealingly and at the same time so forcefully, in the field of economics, as did Henry George."

It is true, as Professor Brown also says, that "the message of 'Progress and Poverty' is certainly as applicable today as when the book was first printed." For this reason, it is also true that a modernized version of George's classic may be needed. Brown has opened the field. Perhaps his work will pave the way towards other short-cut methods of stimulating reader interest.

#### CENTENARY SOUVENIRS

"This Struggle"—written and compiled by Dr. Edgar W. Culley for the Centenary of the Birth of Henry George—Melbourne, Australia, 1939. 92 pp.

This is one of those charming books in which gems can be found on every page. It is a collection of writings on the Georgeist philosophy which deal with the ethical and moral phase. And the book preserves this lofty tone throughout. It brings into interesting relationships such subjects as religion, politics, medical science, economics, philosophy—and shows the basic oneness of the problems underlying these fields. The author's closing words suggest what that oneness is:

"Science and achievement, with the will to live in harmony with Infinite laws, will point the way to the perfect day dawning in the distance."

Dr. Culley has also compiled a neat little work of 16 pages, under the auspices of the Henry George Leagues of Australia. It is entitled, *A Centennial Year Booklet*, and abounds in words of wisdom from important historical characters. The various excerpts lead up to and support Dr. Culley's concluding words: "Learn and Obey the Natural Law."

No price is mentioned in either of the above works. Those interested may communicate with Dr. Edgar W. Culley, 450 Collins St., Melbourne, C I, Australia.

## Correspondence

#### THE McGLYNN CASE

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I want to express my appreciation of and thanks for P. J. O'Regan's comment on my book, "Rebel, Priest and Prophet," which is most informing as well as interesting. I can find in it only one point on which he seriously dissents from my view of Father McGlynn, who, he insists, was not a "rebel." The word seems to carry in Mr. O'Regan's mind an odium it entirely lacks in mine. There are rebels and rebels, and judgment on them must hinge on one's judgment of the merits or demerits of their rebellion. That Father McGlynn was no rebel against the true Church or its doctrines I will admit at once, yet it is a historical fact that a misuse of ecclesiastical authority by his archbishop forced him into the attitude of a rebel against such misuse of authority. His subsequent complete vindication and restoration to the priesthood without being required to retract one word of the Georgian land doctrine which his archbishop had condemned so strongly, seems to me to have justified his rebellion against the "ecclesiastical machine" rather than altered the fact of his rebellion.

I want especially to thank Mr. O'Regan for his recital of former rebels against misuse of ecclesiastical authority who were later vindicated, much of which is news to me, and most informing. It would be well for the present "higher-archy" of the Church of Rome—and the authorities of other Christian churches as well—to ponder

their mistakes of the past, re-examine their present attitudes on the issues which impel men, classes and nations to conflict, and see if and how far they have departed from "the law and the prophets" which Jesus of Nazareth so strongly endorsed in His Sermon on the Mount (Matt. V, 17-18).

Especially do I regret knowing nothing of the letter of Archbishop Walsh of Dublin in which he said of Archbishop Corrigan's pastoral letter of 1886: "It is very plain, very painfully so indeed, that the Archbishop of New York whose pastoral condemns it ('Progress and Poverty') so strongly, cannot have read it at all," for I would have been pleased to quote so high an authority on that point.

In the recent Encyclical of Pope Pius XII I think I see the beginning of a fulfilment of Mr. O'Regan's confident prediction that "men will yet arise in the Church to pursue the path indicated by Bishop Nulty and Father McGlynn," for in the course of it he commented thus on St. Paul's declaration that "God hath made of one blood all mankind to dwell upon the whole face of the earth":

"A marvelous vision, which makes us see the human race in the unity of our common origin in God, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all, in the unity of nature, which in every man is equally composed of material body and spiritual immortal soul; in the unity of his immediate end and mission in the world; *in the unity of the dwelling place, the earth, of whose resources all men can by natural right avail themselves to sustain and develop life.*"

Man has travelled far from the path of freedom and justice blazed by Moses and the prophets and confirmed by Jesus of Nazareth, and it will be long ere he regains that path, but that he will do so eventually there can be no doubt. He could regain it quickly if he but would.

Delawanna, N. J.

STEPHEN BELL.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Re Hon. P. J. O'Regan's article in your Nov-Dec. issue, we all know that Father McGlynn was never a rebel against the Catholic Church.

His boyhood ambition was to be a priest. His young manhood's desire was to be a priest. He became a priest of outstanding ability and character. He was a rebel only against the politics of the New York City officials of the church.

When he was excommunicated it hurt him physically as well as spiritually. We all rejoiced at his reinstatement. Henry George's telegram was: "We are kneeling before the altar of your old church in thankfulness for your restoration. Signed Annie and Henry George." This I got from Sylvester Malone's notes.

He was received back into the church *standing*. This he told a few of us at an intimate meeting after his return to New York.

He did not get back to St. Stephen's Church—not until he was dead. Home at last.

His address at Henry George's funeral was excelled only by that of St. Paul on Mars Hill.

I hope that when the Church gets ready to canonize him (as it will) they will give him his full name—Saint Edward McGlynn.  
London, Canada.

CHRISTINE ROSS BARKER.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I have yet to find a Henry Georgeite who would or could write a practical plan for changing over from our present general property system to the land tax system.

I have attempted it, in a proposed tax amendment to the New Jersey State Constitution.

I hold, too, with the Editor of *The American City*, that the land value tax would not give us enough revenue.

Holmdel, N. J.

THERON McCAMPBELL.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Congratulations on the article "Concepts of Rent," which shows that there is no fundamental difference of reasoning between the Eastern and Western concepts. One approach is perhaps more political, the other more politico-economical. The best one will be the one that gets started, the one that will be voted for.

To me the concept of rent from the West has the advantage of being clearer concerning *ownership rights*. But fundamentally, the reasoning is the same, and based on justice.

Cashmere, Wash.

W. VAN DER MAATEN.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

No Georgeist who has read the last number of LAND AND FREEDOM should hesitate a moment about helping to support it financially. While we all feel the loss of Joe Miller, LAND AND FREEDOM has not suffered by his death. I enclose my mite.

New York City.

FREDERIC CYRUS LEUBUSCHER.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

We like the fair-minded way in which you report both sides of questions and give the other fellow a chance to tell his side of the case, even if you do not see things the same way. The paper is a valuable worker for the cause.

Toronto, Canada.

D. E. COATE.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I have circulated all the numbers of LAND AND FREEDOM after reading them and hope very much that the ideals and common sense of that wonderful man, Henry George, may thereby spread and take root. I wish you every success in your splendid endeavors in giving to the public a paper of such worth as your journal.

Montreal, Canada.

(Mrs.) L. V. COWLES.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I congratulate the Editors of LAND AND FREEDOM upon the high quality of the magazine maintained since the death of Mr. Miller; and hope to see its circulation and influence constantly increased.

If I should offer any suggestion it is that the working Single Taxer, in explaining it to the man on the street, does not, and need not, know accurately all of the finer distinctions in economics. For instance: Does society create ground-rent? or only the value of ground-rent? If the man on the street can see that ground-rent is an unearned income to the land owner, he has gone a long way in the right direction. The experts need not waste too much time or printed space on the finer technical distinctions.

Oshkosh, Wisc.

JOHN HARRINGTON.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

About a year and a half ago I was introduced to the Georgeian philosophy. After completing six or seven classes of "Progress and Poverty" my interest in these sessions began to lag, because of the feeling that these studies were a bit too deep for me.

But I was fortunate in that I had a most ardent follower of Henry George, John Radcliffe, our Secretary of the Cleveland extension of the School, take time outside the class hours to help me understand the concept of justice, the importance of which I had failed to realize before.

It is with this realization and appreciation that I enclose my contribution at this time to keep LAND AND FREEDOM going—and may it never stop.

Cleveland, Ohio.

STANLEY BANASIK.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

WE have just received the sad news of the death of Abel Brink, noted Danish Georgeist, and for many years a special correspondent of this paper. A fuller account will appear in our next issue.

ANOTHER good comrade has passed on; another ardent worker of the earlier days of the Henry George movement. Dr. Walter Mendelson, physician, died January 19, at his home in Germantown, Philadelphia, at the ripe age of eighty-two. We quote from the *New York Times* of January 20:

"A man of versatile mind, Dr. Mendelson enthusiastically embraced numerous activities in addition to his professional duties. He was an ardent believer in the Single Tax doctrine and was a close friend of the late Henry George, foremost exponent of the theory. . . .

"Henry George was one of Dr. Mendelson's patients. They became close friends and the physician did all he could to further the political fortunes of Mr. George and the doctrine of the Single Tax. In 1897, when Mr. George felt it to be his duty to run for a second time for the Mayoralty of New York City, Dr. Mendelson warned him that he would thereby endanger his life. Mr. George entered the race and died during the campaign."

There are those who recall Henry George's unforgettable answer to Dr. Mendelson's warning. "This campaign may prove to be too much for me," he said. "But if it does kill me, perhaps my death may do more for the truth I have tried to preach than all my life has done."

Dr. Mendelson retired from active work in his profession many years ago. But to the last he remained an ardent Georgeist who never missed an opportunity to speak for the truth, and bring it home to others.

MARY FELS has rewritten the life of her late husband, Joseph Fels, who was a believer and prodigious worker in the doctrine of Henry George. The book is now in the hands of the publishers, Doubleday, Doran & Co., and will appear shortly.

ELIZABETH MAGIE PHILLIPS of Arlington, Va., inventor of the Landlord's Game and that other game, Monopoly, which took the country by storm a few years ago, is now at work on a new game which will deal with Free Trade.

HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM, editor of *The American City*, has an article in the February, 1940, issue of *Survey Graphic*. This is a special issue on housing, and Mr. Buttenheim's article deals with the taxation phase, and is entitled "Taxes in Search of a Resting Place." He analyzes the various possibilities of tax sources, and shows that land value taxation is the most stable. He also points out the absurdity of confusing land and buildings together in the term "real estate."

ALBERT L. MEGGINSON, violinist and pupil of L. D. Beckwith, is circulating a very interesting tract which expresses the Georgeist proposal in a simple chart which can be seen at a glance. On one side of the chart is the present system:—Rent, pocketed by landlords; taxes, levied for government; and the remainder for labor and capital. The other side represents the Georgeist plan:—Rent, to finance government; the remainder for labor and capital and no taxes.

WE have received a set of the tracts which Charles Le Baron Goeller prints for circulation. They are pithy little things, fine to hand to novices. In one of his tracts, Goeller urges Georgeists to read "An Introduction to Mathematics" by A. N. Whitehead. "When people become mathematically precise," says Goeller, "and employ logical reasoning, they are forced to become Single Taxers. Socialism, Communism, etc., are the result of loose thinking."

L. D. BECKWITH has reprinted in his paper, *No Taxes*, the article "Concepts of Rent" by John R. Nichols, which appeared in the Nov.-Dec. issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. Beckwith praises the article for its fair-mindedness, and answers it by upholding the concept of rent out of the West—which is, that rent is paid for public service alone and not for the intrinsic differential qualities of the soil.

THE Single Tax Corporation of Fairhope, Alabama (the largest enclave of economic rent in the United States), held its annual meeting on January 15. The treasurer reported that rent collections for 1939 amounted to \$27,020.88, of which \$19,664.13 had to be paid for the taxes levied on the land, improvements and personal property of the lessees. This consumed more than two-thirds of the total. The remainder was spent on improvements for Fairhope. The budget exceeded the rent income by \$1,532.52, and this was raised from other sources. The excessively high taxes levied prevented the rent income from taking care of all expenses, but on the whole, the report may be considered encouraging, since rent collections for 1939 were higher than in many years.

WE have learned from Don L. Thompson of Spokane, Wash., that William Matthews, veteran Georgeist, has passed away at the age of seventy-four. Mr. Thompson writes of Matthews:

"No sacrifice was ever too great for this untiring soul to make in his efforts to contribute something to the economic enlightenment of his fellow citizens. Very few people have had a better understanding of our economic problems than he, and no one has done more to help to solve them. He was always giving freely of his time and money to help usher in a better day for the forgotten man, even when it meant a loss of business and personal prestige.

"The Science of Political Economy has lost a real champion by the passing of this able disciple of Henry George. Were it not for the fact that the good work of men like him will continue to bear fruit long after their bodies have returned to dust, I would lose all hope for a better day for those who now live on this earth only by the sufferance of others."

SUPPLEMENTING our notice in the Nov.-Dec., 1939, issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, of the death of George White, we are glad to publish the following account, which was sent us by Mr. Charles H. Ingersoll.

"George White was one of the old timers of the Georgeian movement and a man of tireless and colorful activity in the cause.

"He was born in England and followed Henry George in his choice of the 'Art Preservative' as his trade and business. He was for many years manager of the New York branch of the Western Newspaper Union which was the pioneer in the 'Patent Inside' and 'boiler plate' country newspapers.

"I met George White along with a lot of the originals of the Brooklyn Single Tax Club, first in the year 1882, shortly after I arrived from Michigan. The names of Peter Aitkin, George Atkinson, John H. Maclagan, Nelson Gage, Martin Battle, Jerome O'Neill, and others were among these; all of them more or less active also in the Manhattan Single Tax Club whose organization had the distinction of being a little closer to Henry George.

"George White never sympathized much with the idea of the 'all-at-oncers' that taxation was not the best way to approach the land question; and his respect for Shearman led him, in the last year, to grow a luxuriant beard like 'Tearful Tommy's.' Shearman's firm, Shearman and Sterling, is still the Standard Oil Law firm.

"White was a good speaker and an even better writer and was always a leader in debates and very sound in his reasoning. In recent years he has lived in and around Long Branch; and besides all this mixing in civic affairs he was an inveterate letter writer and pamphleteer and rated high as a N. J. Single Taxer. He leaves a nephew, Frank, and in England many relatives."