

March—April, 1940

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE-TAX REVIEW

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

## Georgeism and Thomism

Robert C. Ludlow

## Democracy in Denmark

Holger Lyngholm

## Handicaps on Building

H. Bronson Cowan

## Society Psychoanalyzed

Francis Jacobs

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.

MARCH — APRIL, 1940

VOL. XL

No. 2 WHOLE No. 219

## 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 .....	35
GEORGEISM AND THOMISM .....	Robert C. Ludlow 36
COOPERATION AND DEMOCRACY IN DENMARK	
Holger Lyngholm	38
HANDICAPS ON BUILDING .....	H. Bronson Cowan 40
SYDNEY AND NEW YORK .....	Walter Fairchild 43
MORE ABOUT SHARECROPPERS.....	Grace Isabel Colbron 45
SOCIETY PSYCHOANALYZED .....	Francis Jacobs 46
A REVOLUTIONARY REFORM.....	Hon. Henry H. Wilson 48
A SUPERIOR RACE .....	Thomas N. Ashton 49
RENT IN JURISPRUDENCE.....	Jacob Schwartzman 50
BY-PRODUCTS OF EDUCATION.....	Willis A. Snyder 51
A TRIBUTE TO ABEL BRINK .....	52
FELLOW JOURNEYMEN .....	53
SIGNS OF PROGRESS .....	54
THE FAME OF EMPEROR NORTON .....	59
BOOK REVIEWS .....	59
CORRESPONDENCE .....	61
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS .....	63

## WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

*We declare:*

That the earth is the birthright of all Mankind and that all have an equal and unalienable right to its use.

That man's need for the land is expressed by the Rent of Land; that this Rent results from the presence and activities of the people; that it arises as the result of Natural Law, and that it therefore should be taken to defray public expenses.

That as a result of permitting land owners to take for private purposes the Rent of Land it becomes necessary to impose the burdens of taxation on the products of labor and industry, which are the rightful property of individuals, and to which the government has no moral right.

That the diversion of the Rent of Land into private pockets and away from public use is a violation of Natural Law, and that the evils arising out of our unjust economic system are the penalties that follow such violation, as effect follows cause.

*We therefore demand:*

That the full Rent of Land be collected by the government in place of all direct and indirect taxes, and that buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries and incomes, and every product of labor and intellect be entirely exempt from taxation.

## ARGUMENT

Taking the full Rent of Land for public purposes would insure the fullest and best use of all land. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. Thus the job would seek the man, not the man the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product.

The freeing from taxation of every product of labor would encourage men to build and to produce. It would put an end to legalized robbery by the government.

The public collection of the Rent of Land, by putting and keeping all land forever in use to the full extent of the people's needs, 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

MARCH—APRIL, 1940

No. 2

## Comment and Reflection

**T**HE cause of Free Trade has been advanced through the efforts of Secretary of State Cordell Hull. While he does not propose the elimination of all trade barriers, he deserves approbation for his sincere and intelligent attitude on international trade. He indeed appears to be one of the few men in the present administration who may be credited with a modicum of economic sanity. It is true that his program is by no means the full measure of Free Trade to which Georgeists aspire, but it is none the less a ray of hope in this strife-torn world. The trade agreements of the United States with other countries have undoubtedly contributed to gains in our foreign trade—and trade means peace.

**I**T is encouraging to note the endorsement of the Hull program now coming from various quarters hitherto silent. Outstanding authorities, even those previously known as high tariff and self-sufficiency advocates, are speaking out in favor of mutual trade agreements. Interesting, for example, is the case of Mr. Neville Chamberlain. Though his party stands for high tariffs, he is nevertheless the one statesman in England who is urging support for Hull's trade treaty efforts. Can it be that there is still a lingering nostalgia in England for her blasted Free Trade tradition?

**I**N our own United States, Thomas W. Lamont, a partner in the banking house of J. P. Morgan, has also declared himself in favor of Hull's trade agreement legislation. This in spite of the fact that he is a staunch Republican. Mr. Lamont admits the failure of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act. That piece of legislation, he says, "was the last straw. . . . It raised the barriers as never before. . . . But its far worse consequences were its evil effects on the whole world of international trade. . . . A score of nations followed America's example and there developed the vicious circle of higher tariff barriers all around." Mr. Lamont makes a fervent plea for support of Hull's program, regardless of other party issues.

**A**NOTHER endorsement comes from a French authority. An article by Paul Reynaud appears in the current *Atlantic Monthly*. At the time it was written,

M. Reynaud was the French Minister of Finance, but by the time of its publication he had been raised to the position of Prime Minister and Foreign Minister. In his article, Reynaud praises Cordell Hull for the results achieved in the extension of the trade pacts "and the courageous reiteration of his policy in spite of the war." Reynaud wisely stresses the need for Europe's economic reorganization after the present conflict, "if peace is to be something more than another brief armistice." He is in agreement with the widely-held conception that the Treaty of Versailles has been responsible for the misfortunes of Europe, "in making the customs boundaries coincide with the political frontiers . . . when it would have been possible—at least within certain limits—to impose upon them a customs union."

**R**EYNAUD points to the example of the forty-eight sovereign states of the United States, and declares that our country is "the greatest area of free trade opened to human activity that exists today." In fairness to the truth, however, we should remind M. Reynaud that this "greatest area of free trade" looks better at a distance than it does at home. The growth of interstate barriers within these United States is being viewed with some apprehension. Nevertheless, it serves to emphasize the importance of Mr. Hull's good work in the international area.

**I**N the face of these and other difficulties; it is yet heartening to observe the transition of some of our leaders to Free Trade thought. The World of Today is suffering from the errors of its leaders of the World of Yesterday. Perhaps today's leaders are becoming sobered by the frightful results of past errors, not the least of which was the extreme nationalistic spirit that has prevailed in the interim between the two world wars. All of this may serve to remind us of the implied prophecy in: "Is it too soon to hope that it may be the mission of this Republic to unite all nations—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?"

## Georgeism and Thomism\*

By ROBERT C. LUDLOW

THE opening chapters of Henry George's "Science of Political Economy" are so congenial to Thomistic thought that the question in many minds is why neither system has made any great use of the other or why attempts at a rapprochement are met (usually by Thomists) coldly. I think there are two basic reasons for this—one, that each school looks at problems with a different "mind-set" and the other, difficulties rising from verbal definitions—the use of words having a distinct meaning to one and an indistinct meaning to the other. The use of the word "capital" is an example of this latter and to it we could add such words as "freedom," "liberty," "laissez-faire."

As to "mind-set" (and it is probably the most difficult obstacle in the way of assimilation), a typical Thomist outlook is expressed in the recent statement of the episcopate that "there are two attitudes which represent extreme positions respecting our economic and social order. The one attitude is espoused by those who reject any and every kind of economic planning or organization. They constitute the group of extreme individualists or so-called school of economic liberalism. They want no interference whatsoever with the individual either from the government or from the social pressure of group organization. They will tolerate no restrictions upon individual initiative or personal enterprise. They are liberal only to the extent that they wish to be liberated from all social responsibility. They call it free enterprise, but the freedom is for those who possess great resources and dominating strength rather than for the weak or those who depend simply on their own labor for well-being." Or, to put it briefly, the Thomist casts his lot quite definitely with the "social planners." His outlook is historical. He might see that if the sources of production were free, free enterprise holds no dangers—but he sees that in fact they are not so and seldom have been so and on that basis he forms his judgments.

But the Georgeist has his own "mind-set." To quote Mr. Frank McEachran: "Granted the public appropriation of land values, capitalism in its essence would still remain, but so changed in range and manner of operation that the first to derive benefit from it would be the worker and the worker, moreover, as an individual. . . . Far from being too laissez-faire the nineteenth century was not laissez-faire enough and it is possible that in

pointing this fact out we may perform a service of the greatest importance."

Here we have the two outlooks. Can they assimilate? I think so, when Georgeists forget a bit about paper logic and Thomists realize that, provided the possibility of private (absolute) ownership of natural resources be abolished by public appropriation of economic rent, the best kind of planned economy may be an unplanned one. But the way is not made easier by uninformed treatments of the Georgeist philosophy common among Thomists, or by uncritical approaches to current affairs shown in some Georgeist books.

And now as to verbal disagreements. The word "capital" will serve as an example. While it is true there is nothing to fear from capital, as George presents capital, yet the Georgeist system is not the capitalist system as it exists today. And while Georgean writers speak of capital with a logical definition of it in mind they often overlook the psychological reaction in the radical mind to the terms "capitalism" and "laissez-faire"—this because they are almost invariably considered by most people in the historical rather than the logical sense. And that capitalism and laissez-faire, historically considered, are not compatible with the Georgean system seems rather evident to me. It will of course be pointed out that the Thomist criticism of capitalism is only criticism of the capitalist in the role of land-owner. But that overlooks what many writers term the "soul" of capitalism. And it is this "soul" or "spirit" that many radicals have in mind when they reject the system.

Thus by capitalism in the historic sense I mean capitalism as a system of thought or a mode of life—as related to the rise of Protestantism by Weber, Tawney and O'Brien and traced further back by Fanfani, or, more recently, dissociated from Protestantism by Forrester. Of course when we come to the "capitalist," Georgeists are correct in seeing him a person for evil only in his role of landowner. Nevertheless historians do write of capitalism and we do have a period we speak of as the capitalist period and we do connect laissez-faire with the Manchester school of economics, and that school of economics is certainly no foundation for the Georgean doctrines. Not that principles of the Manchester school cannot be utilized, but that Georgeism is more than Ricardo tacked on Adam Smith.

Now Georgeans are rightly annoyed when told it is moral reform we need rather than economic reform (indeed it is, but only in the sense that economics, as the Thomists say, is but a subdivision of moral theology), and point out that however angelic man may be, if our present system remains unchanged, poverty and social grief will still be with us. But this should not be made cause for asserting that after Georgean principles have been adopted (in a sense we quibble, for will Georgean

\*By Thomism is meant the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas. It is considered the official philosophy of the Roman Catholic Church, and is accepted by most Catholic thinkers. Mr. Ludlow, the author of this article, is a graduate of the correspondence course of the Henry George School of Social Science.

principles be adopted without moral reformation?) moral reform will follow of itself—and so make unnecessary any attack on the capitalist spirit as such. And this because capitalism (historically considered) has starved the souls of men, has made the economic criterion supreme and has denied the legitimacy of extra-economic considerations. And it has mechanized man and has debased culture to the seeking after gain, has commercialized the stage, corrupted our newspapers and hindered the progress of science.

Criticisms of the capitalist system by such men as Penty, Robbins, Belloc, etc., are not to be lightly passed over. As regards machinery, for example, Penty contends that it should be restricted where it conflicts with the claims of personality or with the claims of the crafts and arts—and not be allowed to trespass seriously upon the world's supply of irreplaceable raw material. And there is room in Georgeist thought to treat of these things—for George did not offer his system as a panacea and would not contend that the single tax when applied would do away with all the problems connected with industrial capitalism. To socialize land rent is not necessarily to solve the money problem or the problem of the mechanization of man.

Fanfani contrasts the capitalist and pre-capitalist spirit—pointing out that the pre-capitalist “considers that appraisements of value in the economic sphere should be governed by moral criteria” while the capitalist “would make the economic criterion the sole norm of such appraisements.”

“Capitalism,” says Berdyaev, “turns relations of men into relations of things. . . . Marxism is a revolt against capitalism, but it has been bred by it and carries the fatal mark of its materialistic spirit.”

It is the refusal of capitalism to consider extra-economic standards which proves so formidable a barrier to the acceptance of Georgeist teachings. And this because James' philosophy of pragmatism gives foundation to the capitalist outlook and denies George's teachings. For once we deny objective morality, once we accept only relativist and evolutionary standards we undermine the whole structure upon which Georgeism as a philosophy rests. If the test of truth is the practical success of it *here and now*, if there are no such things as natural rights and if fundamental truths are not proof against the ages—how can we argue the truth of Georgeist teachings? Who is to tell pioneer man his ownership of land is unjust when it “works” for him here and now? We can say nothing to him if we have no teachings valid in themselves, we cannot answer him if we ourselves are pragmatists and deny the existence of natural rights.

And then what of laissez-faire liberalism? Critics accuse Georgeists of making a fetish of the land. They

might as well arraign them for making a fetish of the air. But they might be on firmer ground were they to charge some Georgeists with making a fetish of freedom. For to make freedom an end in itself is to make a fetish of it. There may be some people who think of the supreme good in terms of the pleasure of choosing between this and that, but not many can think thus. A stringent philosophy of liberty fails to meet the psychological needs of peoples. And it comes of carrying the doctrine of rights too far—it assumes the compulsion of always exercising rights in the individualistic sense. A man has a right to the products of his labor, but is there any moral principle preventing him to forego that right and pool his products in a communitarian society? And so with freedom—it is a means, not an end. The end of any economic system must be the common good, and that takes into consideration man's dignity and does no violence to his freedom and so does not end in totalitarianism. And because the end is the common good it presupposes the people to be willing to forego certain individual goods for the common good. And George, I think, would admit that, and that is not laissez-faire liberalism. For laissez-faire liberalism makes a fetish of freedom, refuses to allow the State to function for the common good, and ignores the communal nature of man. Of this George said, “I differ with those who say that with the rate of wages the State has no concern”—and his whole system calls for the State to put it in action.

The Georgeist teaching on the dignity of man and the necessity of objective moral standards and the right of extra-economic considerations to prevail over capitalist materialism—all these are held in common with Thomists and are the need of men today. In a short article such as this the many problems to be considered in an attempted rapprochement between the two systems of thought cannot all be mentioned and even those mentioned are treated cursorily. But that an earnest attempt of such an assimilation should be made will, I am sure, be the hope of both Georgeists and Thomists.

---

## Please Note

Invite your friends to subscribe to LAND AND FREEDOM. Regular subscription rates—\$2.00 per year. Special trial offer to students and graduates of the Henry George School of Social Science—\$1.00 per year.

May we suggest that our subscribers note the date of expiration of their subscriptions. We would appreciate prompt remittances for renewals.

We request that all correspondence and articles be typed, or legibly written in blue or black ink on white paper.

## Cooperation and Democracy in Denmark\*

By HOLGER LYNGHOLM

THE world looks with amazement upon the progress Denmark has made towards attaining Economic Democracy. Students come from all parts of the world to marvel and learn what secrets lie behind the efficiency and success of her cultural and economic undertakings.

In agriculture particularly has cooperative democracy been achieved. The Danish farmer is above all a thorough cooperator. He functions in harmony with other economic units more successfully than do agricultural workers in any other part of the world. He is linked in a net-work of cooperative organizations. It has been truly said of Denmark that "the threads by which a modern agricultural undertaking is linked economically with the world around are almost all spun by a cooperative organization".

The store from which the farmer buys his goods, the credit association from which he borrows his money, the organizations from which he purchases his seed, fodder, fertilizer and cement, the company from which his electricity is supplied—all are cooperative associations. Likewise, when he wants to sell his produce, he is serviced by various cooperative produce exchange associations. He deposits his savings in a cooperative bank. Even his farm education is made available through cooperative agencies. Information on breeding and well-bred stock is offered by cooperative breeding associations, and he has at his command the most up-to-date theories on agriculture, through consultants appointed by the agricultural control unions.

This cooperative work and control is the factor which gives to the produce from many small farms a uniformity and stability of quality which make it so desirable and well fitted to secure a place in the open world market.

Perhaps the greatest satisfaction to be derived from the success of this cooperative movement lies in the fact that no paternalistic ruler was instrumental in bringing it about. Farmers, teachers and artisans have been the leaders in both local and national associations. The leaders grew with the movement. It has paid so well and worked so smoothly that we find here a country, not only of contented cows, but of contented men and women as well—which is equally important!

Agriculture has not been the only occupation to adopt the system. In Copenhagen, the Danish capital, we also find the movement strong. There are cooperative building associations and many consumer clubs.

\*As we go to press, we learn of Denmark's invasion. May God protect her!

The student will naturally inquire into the inception of this movement.

Let us go back to the early part of the nineteenth century. What do we find? A nation almost in ruins from the effects of the Napoleonic wars, in which she had become involved with England, Russia, Sweden and Prussia. She had lost Norway to Sweden and Helgoland to England. And she was ruined economically as well as politically. The peasants were poverty-stricken, and oppressed by the unmerciful landlords. Under such conditions the people became morose, sullen and suspicious, and hardly capable of associated enterprise. There was no such thing as getting together for cultural purposes. In short, "association in equality" did not exist. So when we now find these people so progressive, cheerful, scientifically-minded and resourceful, we ask: What are the causes of such a remarkable change in the make-up of this people?

Goethe said, "Character makes Character". This, I think, must have had much to do with the change.

A number of great-hearted men arose to inspire their fellowmen by their teachings and their lives. The teachings of these men were such that their precepts were instilled into the life of the whole nation. The results of their work have proven the truth of the epigram, "Educational bonds make the strongest ties".

In 1783 a man was born who was destined for a great work. This man was N. G. Grundtvig, liberal theologian, poet, philosopher and educational reformer. In 1832 he declared his ambition of establishing schools in all parts of Denmark, accessible to all men and women, where they might become better acquainted with life in general and with themselves in particular; where they might receive guidance in civic affairs and in their social relations. He had studied the old Norse cultures and had become familiar with such educational reformers as Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Froebel, and was greatly influenced by their emphasis on the participation of the individual in his education. In Grundtvig's proposed schools, personal growth was to be stimulated. He envisioned a new social life born in freedom, and a new nation brought forth from a new education.

Grundtvig began his work with a series of outdoor meetings, the first being held on Hymelberget, the highest hill in Denmark, with beautiful surroundings. These meetings were arranged somewhat on the order of the old Greek festivities.

The first school was established in 1844. It failed, but seven years later another school was opened which proved successful. However, it was not until after 1864 that the movement took on a definite form. By 1885 a hundred of these Folk Schools were spread throughout Denmark.

The immediate effect of these schools (which we

might say were the birthplaces of modern adult education) was the establishment of a vast number of meeting houses, or community centers, throughout the land. These might be termed the continuation schools, where leaders or teachers usually led the discussions.

Grundtvig conceived of each nation as having a Spirit of its own which expressed itself in the life and ideals of the people. According to this view, it was necessary that much of education be of a historical nature if the students were to better understand themselves as a people. Before Grundtvig's time, art and science were available only to the small so-called cultured class. But Grundtvig wished these higher pursuits to reach all his countrymen. He sought to use his poetic gifts to create art, not only for the few who had esthetic tastes, but for all the people, high-born and lowly, rich and poor. Much of his poetry has been put to music. A good deal of modern Danish culture can be attributed to this great man.

One of Grundtvig's chief educational aims was to reach the soul of the student, to teach him that he can be noble in mind even though he may be engaged in such a lowly pursuit as milking cows or cleaning stables.

At the present time the Folk Schools serve as a constructive and uplifting element in the life of the Danish people. The schools are in reality small communities. The larger buildings serve as lecture halls, gymnasium and dormitory. These are surrounded by a dozen or so cottages for the teachers, usually in a beautiful setting.

The schools are privately owned. The state gives aid either by grants toward teacher's salaries, or by subsidizing needy students without attempts at political control.

The accomplishments of these schools are distinctly related to the intensive development of farmers' cooperatives. It is here that men learn to trust one another. In the cooperative enterprises that trust is translated into terms of associated credit.

The Folk Schools gave the people a new vision, a new mental outlook on the world. In the students a yearning for knowledge was aroused with the added desire to apply their learning, to put it into practice. With the culture and faith imparted by this education, the young men and women have saved not only agriculture but the whole nation. As the feeding upon knowledge begets hunger for more knowledge, and as with the increasing complexities that arise with an advancing civilization new problems are to be met, we find this alert people grappling with bigger and more fundamental problems.

In 1886, Henry George—who had been making an exhaustive study of world conditions, and who only a few years previously had written "Progress and Poverty" which was gaining world attention—was lecturing in England. Jakob Lange, a botany teacher in one of the

Danish agricultural schools at that time, who at an earlier time had attended Oxford, went to England to meet George, and to better acquaint himself with his theories. He was deeply impressed, and two years later he wrote his first article on George's teachings. It appeared in *Hojskole Bladet*, the journal read by practically all Folk School students and teachers. This article, entitled "Freedom and Equality", brought forth much discussion, which culminated in the founding of the first Henry George Society in Denmark, in 1889. This group edited their own publication, and flourished for a while, but expired in 1894. However, the seed thus sown seems to have been re-germinating, for new shoots sprang forth in 1902, when the Henry George Society which now flourishes all over Denmark came into being.

I will not now endeavor to give a history of the accomplishments of this movement. There is an excellent work on the subject by Signe Bjorner, entitled "The Growth of World Thought among our People". I hope that this valuable work will some day be translated into English. Suffice it to say for the present that the Georgeist philosophy is now taught almost universally in the Folk Schools; that Henry George's picture hangs on the walls of most of the small farmers' homes; that there is no section of the country that has not been affected by the many efficient campaigns which the leaders of this movement have waged for true economic emancipation. One of the outgrowths of the Georgist movement has been the organization *Retsforbundet* (The Society for Social Justice), the aim of which is to bring about "The State of Social Justice".

The results of the movement can best be seen in the many legislative reforms, conforming to Henry George's ideas, which have been made during the past twenty-five years. The first step was the revaluation of land separate from improvements. Another step was the granting of home rule to communities for taxation purposes. As a result, many communities have decreased the improvement tax and increased the land value tax. While we in America are faced with the growing problem of farm tenancy, in Denmark 95 per cent of the farmers own and operate their own farms.

In recent years the Georgeist groups have felt themselves strong enough to enter politics with a party of their own, and now have four members in the *Rigsdag*.

So the result of a liberal education which never ceases with age, and which reaches the hearts of a whole people, is the nation of which Frederic C. Howe spoke when he said: "Denmark is a State that is conscientiously planned. It is an exhibit of agricultural efficiency. In no country in Europe is education and culture so widely diffused. In no country is landlordism so nearly extinguished, and in no State in Europe has Economic Democracy evolved with so much intelligence as in Denmark."

## Handicaps on Building\*

### The Australian and New Zealand Solution

By H. BRONSON COWAN

HERE is a growing volume of authoritative opinion that the depressed condition of the building and allied industries on this continent is due to well-defined causes that are capable of adjustment. Similar conclusions were reached in Australia and New Zealand forty years ago. As a result their municipalities and governments have obtained a long start in the application of solutions that only now are beginning to receive serious consideration on this continent.

An imposing list of findings by Canadian and United States commissions, and of statements by municipal and other authorities, could be quoted to show that there are two principal causes of existing conditions. These are, first, speculation in urban land, with consequent inflated prices, booms and depressions, and, second, heavy taxes upon buildings which discourage their erection. These matters are discussed, and methods of dealing with them suggested, in an excellent report entitled, "Our Cities," issued in 1937 by the Urbanism Committee of the National Resources Committee, a body set up by the Federal Government of the United States.

The Committee emphasized the importance of recognizing:

The injurious results of speculation in urban land,

The necessity for obtaining and using a portion of increasing urban land values for the benefit of the public, and,

Reducing municipal taxes on improvements and increasing taxes on land values.

#### URBANISM COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS

The following statements are taken from the report of the Urbanism Committee:

"Gambling in land values has contributed to alternate booms and depressions, raising false hopes, encouraging over-ambitious structures, wiping out private investors, and, all in all, has been one of the major tragedies of American urban life.

"The dispersive developments of recent years have left blighted vacuums in the interiors of our cities and have themselves been vitiated by land prices at a level too high to permit a desirable standard of urban development." (Page 59)

"A real property inventory of 64 cities made in 1934 by the Department of Commerce and the Civil Works Administrations showed that more than one-sixth of 1,500,000 residential dwellings were substandard, about four-fifths of the dwelling units are made of wood, about one-third are over 30 years old, a large proportion are in a state of serious disrepair. Even at their most reasonable figures rentals are so high that they exclude vast blocks of urban families from housing facilities of minimum standard.

"We are now faced with the problem of arriving at a rational urban land policy which, while affording private owners and developers adequate opportunity for wise and profitable land uses, will curb the forms of speculation that prove calamitous to the investing and the tax-paying public." (Page IX)

"A study should be made of the increment tax on real estate in lieu of special assessments, to see whether such a tax would make possible the financing of public improvements more nearly through tax revenue derived from the increased values which these improvements create, and whether such a tax would aid in combatting speculation in land." (Page 81)

"In order that a large proportion of American urban families should not continue to live in unfit dwellings, and in order to supply the urgent need for housing facilities conforming to an acceptable minimum standard for the low-income groups and thus to attack the serious problems of health, welfare and order, which are directly related to inadequate housing, the Committee recommends that:

"State and local authorities should consider the reduction of the rate of taxation on buildings and the corresponding increase of such rates on land, in order to lower the tax burden on home owners and the occupants of low-rent houses, and to stimulate rehabilitation of blighted areas and slums." (Page 76)

#### CANADIAN FINDINGS

The foregoing conclusion agrees with Canadian findings on the same subject. As far back as 1916 the Ontario Government appointed a Commission on Unemployment. The chairman was the late Sir John Willison. Included on this commission were Ven. Archdeacon Henry J. Cody (now Hon. Dr. H. J. Cody), W. K. McNaught, C.M.G., and other prominent men. In its report to the Government, the Commission said:

"The question of a change in the present method of taxing land, especially vacant land, is, in the opinion of your Commission, deserving of consideration. It is evident that speculation in land and the withholding from use and monopolizing of land suitable for housing and

\*This article appeared in the February, 1940, issue of the *Journal of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada*. Reprints of it may be obtained, at five cents per copy, from the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 32 East 29th Street, New York City.



gardening involve conditions detrimental alike to the community and to persons with small means.

"Further, land values are particularly the result of growth of population and public expenditures, while social problems greatly increase in proportion as population centralizes. The relief of urban poverty calls for large expenditures from public and private sources.

"It appears both just and desirable that land values resulting from the growth of communities should be available for community responsibilities. Wisely followed, such a policy involves no injustice to owners of land held for legitimate purposes, and the benefits which would follow the ownership and greater use of land by wage-earners justify the adoption of measures necessary to secure these objects as quickly as possible.

"Your Commissioners are of opinion that a reform of the present system of taxing vacant lands appears indispensable to lessen the evils arising from speculation in land which contributed to the recent industrial depression, and which makes more difficult any satisfactory dealing with unemployment in industrial centres."

#### THE REPRESSIVE TAX ON IMPROVEMENTS

A year and a half ago the Dominion Government called attention to the repressive effect of taxes on buildings when it induced Parliament to enact The National Housing Act, described as "an Act to assist in the Construction of Houses." In the preamble of this Act it is stated:

"Whereas, high real estate taxes have been a factor retarding the construction of new houses and it is therefore desirable to encourage prospective home owners to construct houses for their own occupation by paying a proportion of the municipal taxes on such houses for a limited period."

The fact that since the provisions of this Act came into force the Dominion Government has assumed the responsibility for paying 100 per cent the first year, 50 per cent the second year and 25 per cent the third year, of all municipal taxes on buildings, erected under the Act, costing \$4,000 or less, shows how clearly it is recognized that taxes on buildings interfere with their construction. It is of interest, therefore, to note that, whereas, only 12 per cent of the number of single-family houses built for owner occupancy in 1936 were valued at \$4,000 or less, and 30 per cent in 1937, these percentages, after this provision of the act came into force in July, 1938, jumped for the first full year to 56.5 per cent. Such an increase raises the question what the increase might have been had it been announced that all municipal taxes on buildings were to be removed permanently.

#### THE AUSTRALIAN AND NEW ZEALAND SYSTEM

Forty years ago municipalities in Australia and New Zealand began to realize the injurious effects of having land held out of use for speculative purposes and of taxing buildings. In 1901 in New Zealand they began to remove all taxes from improvements and to increase them on land values. The results proved beneficial. Other municipalities soon followed the example thus set. Today 67 per cent of the people living in cities in New Zealand, and about the same percentage in Australia, live in municipalities where there are no taxes upon buildings and where the bulk of the revenue is raised from a tax on land values.

The Sydney Harbour Bridge in Sydney, Australia, affords a striking example of the benefits derived from retaining for public uses a large share of increases in land values created by the expenditure of public monies. It was realized from the start that the erection of the bridge, one of the largest in the world, which cost \$45,000,000, would enormously increase land values in the territories which it would serve. A special tax of one cent a pound (\$4.80) of unimproved land values was imposed in nine municipalities which would be benefited the most. This tax, which was reduced gradually, was in effect from 1923 until 1937. Small as it was, it produced a revenue of \$10,000,000 which was applied upon the cost of the bridge. In spite of the tax, land values increased. Thus no injustice was imposed on the land owners concerned, while the public benefited by escaping the heavy taxes which otherwise would have been imposed. The tax had the further effect of checking speculation in the land enhanced in value by the erection of the bridge.

Other examples of the same kind could be cited. For example, in New South Wales, the development of motor traffic necessitated expenditures upon main roads, which were beyond the means of local municipal bodies to meet. It was realized that these improved roads would increase land values in the territories served. A Main Roads Board was appointed. Part of the revenue of the board was drawn from a tax of one-half cent on each pound (\$4.80) of unimproved land values in the City of Sydney, the adjoining County of Cumberland and the Blue Mountains Shire. In one year \$1,158,273 was raised from this tax and the following year \$1,300,630. This tax was in addition to the bridge tax and the regular municipal taxes on land values.

#### NO TAX UPON BUILDINGS

The building industries received a great impetus when all taxes were removed from improvements and placed

on land values. The immediate effect was that land values were decreased through speculators relinquishing their holdings. This made it easier for those desiring to build to secure land for that purpose. Ultimately the demand for land for building purposes was so great it restored and finally greatly increased the former land values. The new values were actual as they lacked the former speculative element. The following statements by authorities speak for themselves.

Sydney, Australia, Roy Hendy, City Clerk: "Notwithstanding the municipal revenue is derived entirely from land values, land tends to increase in value; having increased, during the past 22 years, from \$155,000,000 to \$235,000,000—51%."

Brisbane, Australia, City Assessor's Department: "Land tends to increase in value. As far as we can judge, the system has come to stay."

State of Victoria, Australia, Frank A. Henry, American Consul, referring to fourteen municipalities: "The incidence is to bring idle land into use. It tends to increase land values."

Wellington, New Zealand, E. P. Norman, City Clerk: "There is no difficulty in getting revenue by this system."

### EXTENSIVE BUILDING DEVELOPMENTS

The effect of the new system of taxation was to create a building boom that was based on a legitimate demand for buildings as well as on sound values. The metropolis of Greater Sydney affords an example. It comprises over 50 municipalities. All these municipalities, except Sydney, adopted the new system of taxation in 1908. The municipality of Sydney, which comprises the central business area of the metropolis, did not adopt it until 1916.

In 1925, Alderman J. R. Firth, who still is a strong advocate of the system, described the results of the first 17 years' experience under the new method of taxation. On that occasion he said:

"In Sydney there has been an enormous development. In the seventeen years from 1908 to 1924 our population has grown from 550,000 to just over 1,100,000 and by Sydney I mean the City and the surrounding forty metropolitan municipalities" (now over 50). "There has been an extraordinary building boom, interrupted in some degree only during the years of the war. The returns for 1924 show that the number of new buildings brought to completion and connected with the water supply is the largest on record.

"The official figures,' says the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* of 24th December last, 'indicate that the building boom has been more than maintained, as the building trades are busier than ever. The result is that the City is being transformed day by day, and as the old landmarks dis-

appear modern and palatial premises fill their places.' The 'old landmarks' referred to mean shanties and antiquated tumble-down buildings.

"Here are the official figures of new buildings in the metropolitan area as published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 24th December, 1924, showing the results for the last eleven years:

	Buildings Completed	Cost
1914.....	10,546	£ 6,775,548
1915.....	7,632	5,124,464
1916.....	6,283	4,479,118
1917.....	5,401	3,595,992
1918.....	4,998	3,726,896
1919.....	5,830	4,788,804
1920.....	10,015	9,273,569
1921.....	8,537	9,655,163
1922.....	9,084	9,917,963
1923.....	10,450	10,133,116
1924.....	12,180	14,346,071

"The increased population, all but a fraction of the half-million we have added, has settled in the suburbs where land had been 'held for a rise'. The vacant areas have been peopled and the houses have spread themselves out, because the inhabitants have not been held in by a ring fence of monopoly prices for land. I could give many examples to illustrate this spread of population where room was awaiting it. Thus the municipality of Canterbury, five miles from the central area, had a population of 4,000 people in 1901; today, it has over 50,000 people and I think it would be correct in saying that every one of the houses there has sunlight all round it. In my own borough of Strathfield we have made use of our powers under the law to limit houses five to the acre and we have neither terrace houses nor semi-detached houses. Each is a detached house. The growing population has got land cheaper than it otherwise would, and this has ensured liberal space for each house, larger than was provided before the new system came into operation."

### BETTER BUILDINGS ERECTED

The following statements, made early last year, by municipal and other authorities, concerning the general effects of the Australian and New Zealand system of taxation (it is in use, also, in the Transvaal, South Africa), afford an interesting contrast to the results obtained under the system of taxation followed on this continent:

Sydney, Australia (Population 1,360,000), Roy Hendy, Town Clerk: "It has brought idle land into use, improved housing, and old buildings have been replaced by new buildings."

Brisbane, Australia (Population 360,000), The City Assessor's Department: "It has brought idle land into use, with fewer houses per acre. It has not created congestion. We have no slum areas. It has been advantageous to householders, industry and the public welfare.

Napier, New Zealand (Population 18,500), F. R. Waters, Town Clerk: "It has brought idle land into use, improved housing, and reduced slums. There is very little slum area. It has encouraged more houses per acre. In my opinion, it has been advantageous to householders, industry and public welfare. Value of improvements greatly exceeds that of land values."

Witbank, Transvaal, British South Africa, J. J. Turnbull, Town Clerk: "The system has tended to bring idle land into use for the reason that a man pays the same tax for a vacant piece of ground as he does for a similar site with a valuable rent-producing building thereon. Generally, better buildings are erected now than prior to the introduction of the system. Improvement values are more than four times the land."

COMPARISON OF BUILDING STATISTICS

The April issue of *The Municipal Review of Canada* contained a table giving a comparison of the building activities in eighteen countries. The following figures are derived from that table. The year 1929 is used as an index year.

	1929	1932	1935	1937
Canada . . . . .	100.0	16.8	18.6	24.0
United States.	100.0	17.7	26.9	47.9
New Zealand.	100.0	22.3	49.5	81.8
Australia . . . .	100.0	22.7	80.0	99.5

After the war Canada once more will be faced with the necessity of providing gainful employment for thousands of her soldiers as well as for other thousands now engaged in wartime industries. Might not the adoption of the Australian and New Zealand system of municipal taxation provide a solution for this problem and at the same time place our building trades on a sound basis?

THE first man who, having enclosed a plot of ground, took upon himself to say, "This is mine," and found people silly enough to believe him, was the real founder of civil society. How many crimes, how many wars, how many murders, how much misery and horror would have been spared the human race if some one, tearing up the fence and filling in the ditch, had cried out to his fellows: "Give no heed to this imposter; you are all lost if you forget that the produce belongs to all, *the land to none.*"—JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU.

Sydney and New York

By WALTER FAIRCHILD

MISAPPREHENSION has developed among earnest followers of Henry George as to the extent and value of the progress made in Sydney (which has a population of 1,400,000) and other Australian cities, and in New Zealand, toward collecting land rentals by taxation, and relieving buildings from taxation.

Valuable material on the Australian and New Zealand situation is contained in the foregoing article by H. Bronson Cowan, of Peterborough, Ontario. Mr. Cowan has visited all the large cities of Australia and New Zealand, and has had an unusual opportunity to study, at first-hand, conditions in these two dominions. As a supplement to this article, I should like to present some further information obtained from Mr. Cowan on the taxation system of Sydney as compared with that of New York.

Mr. Cowan informs us that he has received a letter from a New York Georgeist, which quotes from an Australian source to the effect that the benefits derived in Sydney have not been as great as anticipated, and which emphasizes the claim that New York is taxing land values more highly than Sydney. It was stated that the rate of taxation in Sydney is only two per cent, whereas in New York it is almost three per cent. This would suggest that New York affords a better example of the application of the Henry George system of taxation than does Sydney, and that Sydney has received much advertising to which it is hardly entitled.

Mr. Cowan has replied to the argument of his correspondent as follows:

"You state: 'The only difference between New York and Sydney is that in the former we tax improvements.'

"That difference is a tremendously important one. The tax you impose upon improvements is a repressive one. The elimination of such a tax would make a great difference. It has in Sydney. I venture to say that there is no comparison between the record for building developments in Sydney and New York over a long period of years.

"You assume that the only tax upon land values in Sydney is the municipal rate of 2% which you mention. Here again you are far from the facts. The whole attitude in Sydney towards the taxation of land values is so far ahead of the attitude in New York, and in this part of Canada also, for that matter, that again there is little ground for comparison. For example, in addition to the municipal tax of 2%, Sydney has at least two additional taxes on land values, and at times more.

"In addition to the municipal rate, they have imposed what are known as Main Road Rates and for years they had an extra rate to pay for the Sydney Harbour Bridge. In 1937, the revenues raised from these three rates were as follows:

Municipal Rate .....	£896,615
Main Road Rates.....	41,108
Harbour Bridge rates.....	44,277
	£982,000
Total .....	£982,000

"In addition to the foregoing, the state imposes a special state tax on land values. The state tax is small in New South Wales but fairly heavy in some of the other states. In Victoria, it produces well over \$2,000,000 a year, and in Queensland, almost \$2,000,000 a year. Bear in mind that the population in these states is not large.

"The revenue raised in New South Wales—much the greater part of it in Sydney—for the Sydney Harbour Bridge alone, over a period of years, was in excess of \$10,000,000. That was all in addition to the municipal tax rate. Have you ever heard of New York, or any other municipality on this continent, doing anything of that kind? That is why I say that when you count in such taxes as these, add them to the municipal tax, and allow for the fact that improvements are not taxed, you are very far astray when you say, or intimate, that New York can be compared with Sydney in these matters.

"Mr. Hodgkiss states that they have slums and other undesirable social conditions in Melbourne. But remember that Melbourne still taxes improvements. Alderman Firth and other authorities state that there are no slums in Sydney. Note the following statement by Alderman Firth:

"Sydney and New Castle, in New South Wales, and Brisbane, in Queensland, the three cities that have made the most marvelous progress in Australia, all enjoy the new system of rating, while Adelaide, the capital of South Australia, under the old system, makes no corresponding progress. Melbourne also has stuck to the old system. It is a remarkable fact that while Melbourne not many years ago was larger than Sydney, it is altogether outdistanced by Sydney.'

"You further state in your letter: 'The elimination of the taxes on improvements, where the tax on land values is not increased to an even larger extent, is to stimulate speculation in land.'

"That is true only where a city needs improvements. The first effect of the elimination of the tax on improvements under such conditions is to promote the erection of the needed improvements—surely a fine thing—and this in turn increases the demand for land and enhances

the price of land. But that condition continues only until the needed improvements have been supplied. To erect improvements after that is just a waste of money. I have in mind two large buildings erected in Vancouver, during the boom period, costing several million dollars, which have been scarcely used at all since they were erected.

"Now let us see what the effect of the land tax was in Sydney. Again I will quote from Alderman Firth:

"There was a case of a man in my own Borough of Strathfield who was paying under the old system £80 a year in rates on a section of land lying vacant. The first year the land value rating came into operation, he had to pay £800. The second year he had sold the bulk of his land. It was taken up by many who were eager to use it. At the same time, others whose land had been developed, who had their house and home on it, found that their rates of £8 or £10 a year had been reduced to £2 or £3 under the new system. In short, the new system is of immense benefit to the man who uses his land well, by taking from his shoulders the burdens he had to bear when improvements were taxed and land values were largely exempt.'

"Surely statements by such men as Alderman Firth, City Clerk Roy Hendy and others, and all to the same effect, as to the benefits derived under the new system, should carry weight."

### "Harvest" — Man and Nature

**I**N recent years the French cinema has risen to the rank of a cultural achievement. The films produced in France combine poetry and realism in penetrating commentaries on different aspects of life. One of the best of them is "Harvest", the theme of which is "the mighty *deux à deux* between man and nature".

It is the story of a deserted farming village. All have left, except one man, Panturle, who lives a half-savage life, until the woman, Arsule, comes. Here now are the elements of a new society—man, woman and the land. Together they live, together they plough the neglected fields, sow the seeds, grow wheat. Panturle threshes the wheat with his own hands. Then he brings it to the market. There is a shortage of wheat that season and Panturle's wheat is the best in the countryside. He gets a good price for it. This from the land that was not considered worth cultivating, that was deserted for the lure of the cities. But, as the caption in the film tells us, Mother Earth will not tolerate being despoiled and deserted. Man must always return to her and learn the lesson all over again. Only thus will society thrive

## More About Sharecroppers\*

By GRACE ISABEL COLBRON

**S**HARECROPPERS Week (March 3rd to 10th) in New York City has come and gone. City dailies said a few words in advance, and the Grapes of Wrath Dinner-Forum on March 5th, at which Mrs. Roosevelt and other notables spoke, received some polite notice. But, just as the Washington Sharecropper Conference in January came to naught, as far as the public knowledge of it was concerned, just so the doings of that week in New York were of little avail, as far as public knowledge was concerned, to the Sharecroppers.

Some newspaper articles spoke of the "migrant workers" (particularly one series of excellent articles in a leading daily), but it was only the "migrant worker," individual and family, with whom all these stories dealt. The specific problem back of the case of the actual sharecropper of the South was touched on very lightly, if at all.

The migrant worker, the wandering farm worker, moving from place to place in search of seasonal work, is quite a different person from the Southern sharecropper. The migrant worker is, as a rule, a lone man cursed with Wanderlust, a "hobo" of a better sort. Jack London, for instance, was a migrant worker at one period of his varied career. He wandered, for many reasons, and found it necessary to work now and then to provide cash for incident expenses, or to work for a night or a week's lodging mayhap. But his case, as the case of most such migrant workers, cannot and should not be confused with the case of the sharecroppers—of many thousands of whole families who are victims of the worst examples of landlordism our country can show. We are just beginning to hear something of their case, their hopeless condition. But the news is changed in transit. The Sharecropper is treated as a "migrant worker", and the actual point, sum and substance of the situation is lost—deliberately smothered, one may well say. It is treated as an individual problem.

To deal with the case of the sharecropper as a social problem would interfere with a large vested interest—with the greatest, the most dangerous of all vested interests, the ability of one man, through undisturbed ownership of land, to make all others work for him, at his price. Working for a landlord at about 10 cents a day, these modern slaves of the landowner are much worse off than the black slaves of a former generation. For those chattel slaves were of actual money value to their owner. The sharecropper is of little money value

to his landlord, who can dispossess him at any moment, and take some one else on in his place.

But the sharecropper has won some friends. He has been organized into a Union that fights for his interests and the interests of his family. The Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, a comparatively new organization already numbering more than 40,000 members among tenant farmers, especially among the sharecroppers, has as its motto: **THE LAND IS THE COMMON HERITAGE OF THE PEOPLE.** A worthy motto indeed. But even this daring Union fails to see the only way by which landlordism can be robbed of its power to exploit. Here is what they suggest:

"For the dispossessed wanderers, the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union proposes federal communities, co-operatively managed, where a new life can begin. It asks that sharecroppers be represented on local committees administering the federal agricultural program. It seeks for agricultural workers the benefits of federal social security laws and the National Labor Relations Act. . . . But the real solution, the Union insists, lies in the establishment of farms of their own, cooperatively run. These farms will produce not only cotton to sell, but vegetables to eat, milk to drink, timber for homes and schools."

Perhaps something can be done that way, but not all that is needed. However, the Union's power and its determination to put through some part of its program to rehabilitate the sharecropper—who asks nothing more than his little home, and earnings enough to support his family—seems to have disturbed, rather seriously, the Southern landlords, the "planters" who are resurrecting a sort of Ku Klux Klan in an attempt to kill the Union. One can respect the Union for the enemies it has made as well as for its constant efforts to bring the sharecropper problem before the public without confusing it with farm problems in general.

Now that the sharecroppers have created some public interest, some very amusing efforts have resulted on the part of those seeking public interest—and eventually, public office. Such, for example, is Thomas E. Dewey's vacuous program for achieving agricultural prosperity.

The attempt to put the case of the sharecroppers comprehensively before the general public has seemed, thus far, to have achieved nothing more than a deserved popularity for John Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath". But at least the surface has been scratched. It may lead to a clearer understanding of this most pitiful condition in our "land of unlimited opportunity". And when it is more clearly understood, the implications in the motto of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union will be more fully realized—the declaration that the land is the common heritage of the people.

\* An article on the Sharecroppers by Miss Colbron appeared in the January-February issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

## Society Psychoanalyzed

By FRANCIS JACOBS

I WANT to try an experiment. I want to examine economic society in the light of today's psychology.

Why is there sweated labour for some and no labour for others? Why, when we seek to improve our homes, do taxes leap up to kill our enterprise? Why are rents so high when so much land is left virgin? What force is at work damming the dynamic energies of industry and agriculture, preventing their harmonious flow?

The source of mankind's life and energy is the Earth. Greek and Roman personified her as the great Goddess of Plenty—Demeter, Ceres. Mankind was nursed at her breast, lovingly tilling her soil to gather her riches, penetrating into her depths to bring up her treasures. And no matter how far he may have wandered from her on his journey into modern civilization, he is still drawing his succour from her. It is his destiny to return always to her. When we die we commit our bodies once again to her care.

I want to try and reconstruct the first psychological crisis of the primitive community.

The drama is set in a fertile valley. Mountains enclose it. The first player is primitive, solitary man. He works all day on the land to produce the wherewithal to live. He lives crudely. His dwelling is a mud hut. He is bound up in Mother Earth. He is the infant. Others wander into the valley and settle on its fertile soil. The little egoist becomes aware of the family. He must become the little altruist.

Now he need no longer work all day. He can exchange what he produces most easily with the produce of other men. His "produce" is his first possession. It can be retained or released at will. By exchanging his possessions, he achieves leisure. There is opportunity for mental development. It is the dawn of conscious reason. Now some are building wooden houses. So he decides to pull down his mud-hut, not without some regret. If one considers the insanitary conditions prevailing in our slums today, one suspects that we have suffered a fixation at the primitive mud-hut level.

Now the first doctor enters the scene. He cures with herbs and is paid in produce. Another is expert at sewing skins; the first tailor is also paid in produce. Produce assumes a new value. It can be exchanged for service. Already man is being weaned from the soil. There is other work afoot. But there are always some left to till it—the farmers—the children. We call them "children of the soil."

As the valley becomes more crowded, *land* gradually becomes an object of possession, an object of love and strife. As the exchanges become more complicated, men

must learn to compromise. They must have laws and abide by them. They hear their first "don't." There are squabbles. So the little men go to the wisest and strongest man in the community; from his wisdom the great man judges between them. From his strength he punishes. He is loved and feared. He is the father of the community; the first king.

But this primitive king is not the wisest and strongest for nothing. He has the finest house and he is the first to stake out a fine piece of land, when land becomes heavily worked in the valley. It is royal, sacred land. It is "taboo." To touch it is death. The little men respect it in fear and love. The great father will devote his time to the community, but he also must live. In return the little men must sacrifice a proportion of their beloved produce, the bounty of their Mother Earth, to the protecting father. A service for a service.

Now a danger threatens the community. As it spreads down the valley, its boundary meets the boundary of another growing community. It is retreat or war. The little men go again for help to the great father. He is growing rich on the service of the community and would not have its boundaries lessened by an inch. It is war. He will be their general. But he will need food and weapons for his army of strong men; so the little men who stay behind must sacrifice a little more of their produce, their beloved bounty. The army returns victorious. The community is bigger and the great man more loved and feared than ever.

But, peace restored, he is no longer giving added service to the community. Will the little men dare to point out that *their* added service should also now be cancelled? The big man is not going to point it out for them. Besides, he now has an army. It is for the little men to speak. Will they accept this burden of added taxation, of added sacrifice, or is it to remain a single mutual tax? The mingled love and hate for the tyrant colour the wish to speak with guilt. Is he not also their protector, their judge, their all-wise, their all-powerful one, their God? The longer the wish remains unspoken, the more guilty it grows.

Yet another factor creeps into the complex situation. The great man is growing old and wishes to ensure his privileges for his son. He boldly encloses his piece of land with a fence. The little men stand speechless before the "taboo." The great man sees their fear and boldly encloses more and more land. The little men, who have already sacrificed so much, are now losing their grip on the beloved Mother Earth. The more they love the land and work on it—building roads and bridges—the more valuable the big man's enclosure grows. And as the inheritors of the land increase in numbers, the land grows more scarce and ever more valuable, their need for it ever more passionate. But it belongs to the father, the king.

How to meet this complex situation? The great father must be killed. Impossible! Impossible to kill the loved one; to entertain the guilty wish for a moment is to wish back certain death on oneself. Fly far from the country? But to the primitive mind there is no world beyond the community and the valley where it lies. To go away into the mountains is death.

Here is the first big decision of the community. Which is the safest and easiest way out? Dismiss it. Bury it. Repress it. With but few exceptions, this is the course mankind has taken. He accepts the situation as a loving dependent. If the services due to him from his king are lessened by a despotic ruler, will he dare demand that the ruler pay back the value of the land in kind?

He has branded himself, in fantasy, slave, and accepted the position of an impotent on the land. As far as he is concerned she can remain uncreative—virgin. His love for her is even turned to distaste. Like the neurotic, he is capable of only a debased relationship with Mother Earth. He pays money to a procurer for the privilege of using her. She is the prostitute. Does he demand anything but a barren return? He has denied his claim to the dynamic value of land.

“There is a tide in the affairs of men  
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune.  
Omitted, all the voyage of their life  
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.”

For, although the guilty hostile wish is banished, its shadow, its ghost—as it were—lives on in the unconscious, in the fantasy of the terrible avenging lord. The death-wish is projected on to him. He hovers over men like a doom, binding them in fear.

\*                      \*                      \*

This type-case can be almost bodily applied to England. In it you can recognize her happy “kindergarten” existence under Alfred the Great, then the Danegeld, which collected an annual £72,000, twenty-seven years after the invasion was over, the Feudal System, the enclosures, and the “rogues and vagabonds” who swept over the country after the enclosures—the nucleus of today’s unemployed, our economic impotents.

As the burden of taxation and oppression became more severe, the burden of apparent guilt shifted on to the other side, on to the land-owners. The little man who would not dare to speak in the first place now has his tongue cut out if he dares to squeal. When Parliament might have given him a voice, he could not raise it. If it were raised for a moment, a war was arranged to distract attention from the radical problem, to give scope for increased taxation, and to provide a safety-valve for the repressed hatred—still strong unconscious motives for war. In 1660, the Convention Parliament did actually propose the abolition of Excise Duties, and a Tax on

Land Values. The Stuarts retaliated with the trump card of Rulers—the Divine Rights of Kings. The primitive in man was face to face once again with the painful, ambivalent emotions aroused by the God-tyrant.

With the Industrial Revolution, our amorphous energies were suddenly harnessed to a new dynamo. It was like the coming of puberty to the boy, when the amorphous interests of the child are harnessed to the sexual dynamo. We can see the character-formation clearly for the first time. In England, we see a people already worn out by pestilence and torture. What should have been the greatest boon to mankind, they gratefully accepted at starvation wages and a sixteen-hour day. The great boon was only a source of added profit to the few, and added slavery to the many. Most of all, it has been the means of repressing still deeper the original situation. Housed in his dark slum, his nose eternally bent over the grindstone, the poor primitive has forgotten his gently sloping fields. So the neurosis “grows with what it feeds on.”

What can be learned from this psychoanalytic approach to the Land Question? We can see, perhaps for the first time, the full strength of the resistance we are fighting. In the last chapter of “Progress and Poverty,” Henry George says “The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be, it would have been accepted long ago. If that could be, it would never have been obscured.” We can give these lines a fuller meaning.

Beneath the defiant silence of the landowners, the infant is still clinging to its beloved “possessions.” Beneath the slavish snobbery of the masses and the inarticulate ignorance of the poverty-stricken, the infant is still clinging to its paralysing fantasies. Beneath the sign “Trespassers will be prosecuted,” we can read “taboo,” and beneath “taboo”—death.

We see now why men shy away from their birthright like frightened animals; why they slip off the noose for a moment, only to slip it on again under another name—Democracy or Bolshevism; why those with the needed land reform are sometimes doubtful how to proceed; whether they should present the case under this name or that name, whether they should aim at a sudden upheaval or a gradual reform.

We must sow our seed where the resistance is weakest, where there is a healthy discontent with the existing order. The reviling of our opponents is clearly so much wasted breath. The fault, if you can call it such, is more in the oppressed than the oppressor.

Psychologically, the mass of us are still only school-children, and the process of education is bound to be slow. We shall need patience. Ferdinand Lassalle compares the reformer at work to the chemist, when his retort cracks in the heat. “With a slight knitting of his

brow at the resistance of the material, he will, as soon as the disturbance is quieted, calmly continue his labour and investigations."

Our reform can only come through the mass of individuals. It can only come with enlightened education. History, uncensored, must be taught in our schools. Among our teachers, the thinker must replace the sergeant-major. Men's minds must be trained to think deeply and fearlessly. Whenever they think deeply enough, they can find the Single Tax.

A time may come when the mass of men will see their fear for the fantasy it is. Throwing off their burden of guilt, they will throw off their burden of taxation, and rediscovering the debt, forgotten so long ago, claim a Single Tax for a Single Tax. When the land is taxed to its full yearly value, the great monopoly will be broken and the country thrown open for the people. Then will private ownership of land cease to be a source of profit, and a man live only by his labour. Then will there be work for all and leisure for all, and the great energies of the community will flow ever back to replenish the community.

## A Revolutionary Reform

By HON. HENRY H. WILSON

**S**INGLE-taxers are loathe to acknowledge the revolutionary implications of the socialization of rent and rental values. Our feudal economy is built on the privilege of private ownership of land, and all economic values are based on the power of exaction inherent in such privilege. This value has been capitalized and put under the charges of interest, and this capitalization is the depository of thrift, savings and security. It is represented in the assets and solvency of life insurance, fire insurance, and trusts, and in most if not all of private debts, such as mortgages, judgments, etc. Also a large proportion of corporate bonds and stocks may be included. Therefore to destroy the privilege of private appropriation of land values is much more than a shift in the incidence of taxation. A whole new economy will have to be evolved, and we will have to pay a great price for liberty, at least during transition. The reason single-taxers should squarely face the momentous changes, is that these changes, if not known, are at least sensed by the mass of the people, and I have no doubt that the opposition to the single tax emphasizes these changes, while its protagonists dodge the issue, and thereby lose a certain quality of appeal. The Marxists preach revolution of the disinherited against poverty and oppression. The single-taxers proclaim freedom—at a price, and the real work is to persuade people to pay it.

I believe that there are also other tactical errors into which the single-taxers fall, which give rise to a confusion of thought altogether disconcerting to the uninitiated. One of these concerns assessments. With value gone, what is to be assessed? Nothing but the privilege of occupancy and use, and the fixing of the value of the privilege can only be by governmental fiat.

Another error is in referring to unearned increment as a "fund", conveying the idea that it may be drawn on as a checking account. Taxes, or the costs of government, come out of the products of labor applied to land; they are really paid by the pick and shovel, just as rent is paid. The real objection is to double robbery, taxes and rent. The elimination of taxes, by rent being taken as a substitute, is the idea to be stressed. Every dollar the producer can withhold from the landlord and the tax-collector is a dollar for larger consumption and increasing production.

Again, single-tax is not a mere fiscal system. It is a method of determining the source and amount of government income. It proposes to use as the sole measuring unit the value of land irrespective of improvements. With a given sum to be raised, and site values determined, the tax fixes the contribution. This necessarily means a high tax on land, but in most instances, as where land is improved by homes, a lower total tax. The damage done the speculator will be compensated by the opening of opportunity, stimulation of building, and a general quickening of human life.

And finally, the single-taxers fail to appreciate that, in the last analysis, single-tax is a land question—agrarian at heart. As I understand the teaching, when the land speculator and the forestaller of opportunity have been put to rout, then labor may have some measure of choice between working for itself or for another. Where is he to go to work for himself and at what? The only answer can be on subsistence farms—as in frontier days—the new frontier being the land acquired by government through defaulted taxes. If this is not so, then the relief from the pressure of glutted labor "markets" is a false doctrine. Therefore the single-taxers should strive to foster the agrarian—by transferring values to it from the values of the urban—by supporting policies which directly and indirectly render farm life easier and more tolerable, and by taking the profit motive out of agriculture. The field must cease to be the servant of the factory, and we must return the factory as the servant of the field.

To be sure I am suggesting a large order, but I am convinced that it is the task before us.

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



## A Superior Race

By THOMAS N. ASHTON

“THE land that will produce luscious fruits, beautiful flowers, useful cereals,” said Aristotle 300 years before Christ came to teach His principles, “will also produce a greater crop; that is, it will produce superior men and women, because man is a partner of all he sees and hears and grows through what he does, and the victories over unkind Nature are his.”

Little did this teacher of Alexander the Great dream that the day would come when man, by means of private appropriation of public land-values would plunge illiterate humanity into such miserable poverty that luscious fruits would lie rotting in the shade of the trees which bore them, whilst man and woman went hungry for fruit; that weeds would grow in wild and rank abandon because the building site on which they flourished then appeared to be less valuable for taxation purposes; that cereals, lacking a market among hungry men and their families, would be burned for fuel.

Little did Aristotle dream that as humanity advanced in the arts and sciences the products of its ingenuity, labor and co-operation would be taken from it in the form of monopoly rent and taxes; that rather than a race of superior men and women there would be driven into economic slavery boys and girls from the age of six years and upwards whom, as an eye-witness of national fame avers, death sets free “inside of four years”. Laboring from six in the morning until seven in the evening, “these weazened pigmies” munched in silence their meagre lunches and then “toppled over in sleep on the floor”. The superior race envisioned by Aristotle proved to be, in part, mill operatives consisting of “dozens of little girls of, say, seven years of age wearing only one garment, a linsey-woolsey dress”; sleep-locked little tots who, at the expiration of the lunch period, were shouted at, shaken, cuffed and even kicked into wakefulness to resume their dulled watch for broken threads in the spinning frames—a long, weary watch carried on in monotonous repetition as little feet ceaselessly paced up and down the alleys between rumbling machines—a terrific rumble which “reduced nervous sensation in a few months to the minimum”—a deadened nervous system in which “the child does not think, he ceases to suffer—memory is as dead as hope: no more does he long for the green fields, the running streams, the freedom of the woods, and the companionship of all the wild, free things that run, climb, fly, swim or burrow . . . memory is seared, physical vitality is at such low ebb that he ceases to suffer. Nature puts a short limit on torture by sending insensibility.”

This is the true picture of Aristotle’s superior race as it existed a few decades ago in these United States. If there be alive today any of these seven or eight year old tots who, having worked in a mill a year, “could never learn to read”, they now should be in the prime of life—well under two score years and ten. We wonder if the report of the writer on sociology accurately forecast the future of these little boys and girls—“a year in the mills and he loses his capacity to play; and the child that cannot play, cannot learn.”

The same old tax system totters on. Publicly-created land-values are garnered into private pockets; privately-created wealth is publicly confiscated by legal sanction, legal decree and legal rigmarole—wealth which comes practically in its entirety from the none-too-large wages of ninety-five per cent of our population—wages which now are being augmented by WPA and PWA jobs created for many millions of unemployed men and women whom Aristotle once visualized as a superior race which was to come long after the ancient and venerable philosopher had made his last observation.

In this land which is thought to be “the land of the free and the home of the brave” there might have been the superior race in fact which it pleased the old-time philosopher to contemplate. Ten or fifteen millions of unemployed men and women have become superior in one or two respects—superior in the art of doing unnecessary “projects”—superior in the art of doing them over again, and all because our tax system—cast in plaster of Paris “precedents” born in the oppressive dignity of “law”—has hobble-hitched and hog-tied industry until it palpitates back and forth between tax-assessor sweats and labor-union chills.

If there be alive today any of these tiny tots we wonder what contribution they have made to Aristotle’s superior race. We wonder if the children of these children are boys and girls of promising physique—well educated—and ready to advance this superior race one more generation toward superlative superiority. Or are the children of these children yet in the aftermath of man’s inhumanity to children?

“I thought to lift one of the little toilers to ascertain his weight. Straightway through his thirty-five pounds of skin and bones there ran a tremor of fear, and he struggled toward a broken thread. I attracted his attention by a touch, and offered him a silver dime. He looked at me dumbly, from a face that might have belonged to a man of sixty, so furrowed, tightly drawn and full of pain it was. He did not reach for the money—he did not know what it was. I tried to stroke his head and caress his cheek. My smile of friendship meant nothing to him—he shrank from my touch, as though he expected punishment. A caress was unknown to this

child, sympathy had never been his portion, and the love of a mother who only a short time before held him in her arms, had all been forgotten in the whirl of wheels and the awful silence of a din that knows no respite.

"There were dozens of just such children in this particular mill. A physician who was with me said that they would all be dead, probably in two years, and their places filled with others—there were plenty more.<sup>1</sup> Pneumonia carries off most of them. Their systems are ripe for disease, and when it comes, there is no rebound—no response. Medicine simply does not act—nature is whipped, beaten, discouraged, and the child sinks into a stupor, and dies."

If it is God's purpose to let us discover in ourselves the depths of our depravity—the stench of our social stinks—the degree of hardness in our hearts—the verity of our vanity in improving upon the laws of Nature—the pomposity of our professorial piffle—the banal ballyhoo of our stuttering statesmen—the petrified culture of our pretentious aristocracy—if all these discoveries are His purpose then our stupid slowness in awakening to our inhumanity o'er tops all other weaknesses, greed and avarice, poll-parrot pretensions and self-centeredness which consumes our days from birth to death.

Occasionally there is a commotion among the well-battered faces of those who cling tenaciously to things-as-they-are. Occasionally someone takes up the battle in behalf of the economic slaves who dully look with suspicion upon the pioneers who would save these slaves who have been led to believe that "the poor ye have always with you" was a command, not a warning. Occasionally a Luther, a Savonarola, an Emerson, a Garrison, a George, a McGlynn has stepped forth with vehement protest against this economic servitude only to be classed as a renegade by those who believe that poverty is essential to dividends and to "capital".

In 1900 the superior race envisioned by Aristotle, nearly twenty-five centuries before, easily could have marshalled, in one small area of this nation, "twenty thousand pigmy bondsmen, half naked, half starved, yellow, weazened, deformed in body, with drawn faces that show spirits too dead to weep, too hopeless to laugh, too pained to feel." Today ten or fifteen millions of fathers and mothers, maturing sons and daughters, easily can dwarf in numbers these twenty thousand pigmies as they form an army of unemployed—dwarf them in numbers, but not in shame, as the victims of a vicious tax system which buys the so-called culture for a vainglorious aristocracy which proudly bears a coat-of-arms in the sign of the almighty dollar.

The sweat-shops of Hester Street—the depravity and degradation of Whitechapel—the Ghetto of Venice—the mines of Siberia—these have been the incubators of Aristotle's superior race.

## Rent in Jurisprudence

By JACOB SCHWARTZMAN

ALL Georgeists know—or should know—the law of rent as formulated by Ricardo, and since accepted by all economists of note. In *Progress and Poverty* the law of rent is stated thus:

"The rent of land is determined by the excess of its produce over that which the same application can secure from the least productive land in use."

In this article, I intend to discuss not the law of rent, but the law *on* rent, i. e., the definitions and functions of rent as interpreted and decided by authoritative legal minds.

The definition of rent as given by Henry George is as follows:

"Rent is that part of wealth which is given for the use of land."

The following are the definitions of rent by accepted authorities of the legal profession:

"Rent (Lat. *reditus*, a return). A return or compensation for the possession of some corporeal inheritance. A certain profit, either in money, provisions, or labor, issuing out of lands and tenements, in return for their use.

"The compensation, either in money, provisions, chattels, or labor, received by the owner of the soil from the occupant thereof." (Bouvier's Law Dictionary)

The late Professor John H. Easterday, in *The Law of Real Property I*, 1932 edition, pp. 51-52, defines rent as follows:

"A rent is a right to a certain profit issuing periodically out of lands and tenements.

"A rent may be created either by conveying land to another person and reserving the rent to the grantor or his heirs, but not to a stranger, or by granting the rent to another person and retaining the land. . . .

"Care must be exercised by the student at all times to note the exact sense in which the term 'rent' is used. The right to demand a profit should never be confused with the profit itself."

Formerly, it was possible not only to sell land, and thus to realize capitalized rent, but also to reserve a perpetual rent in the land conveyed. Such rent inhered in the land, and was forever payable to the original grantor, his heirs, or to any person or persons to whom such an everlasting right was sold. It is interesting to note that while the New York State Constitution abolished such rent, so far as agricultural lands are concerned, this rent in perpetuity may still be conveyed in the cases of city structures or lots, mining lands, etc.

A tenant's liability for rent is not affected by condemnation of part of the leased premises; but where the estate

of both landlord and tenant in the entire premises is extinguished by condemnation, the obligation to pay rent ceases. (*Corrigan v. Chicago*, 144 Ill. 537.)

Payment of rent has become a sacred ritual. Rent must be paid on the day it is due, and courts are very strict in enforcing this rule. No day of grace is given to a tenant. In *Walton v. Stafford*, 162 N. Y. 558, the New York State Court of Appeals affirmed a ruling that rent falling due on a legal holiday other than Sunday is due on that day.

An unconscious recognition of the fact that wealth must be produced before a division thereof goes to the landlord as rent is indicated in the case of *Smathers v. Standard Oil Co.*, 199 App. Div. 368, affirmed 233 N. Y. 617; where the Court said:

"In construing the lease before us, it is also important to recognize the rule that the presumption is that rent is not payable until after it has been earned, and that, in the absence of an express agreement to the contrary, rent is payable at the end of the term, and not in advance."

In *Smith v. Barber*, 112 App. Div. 187, the landlord's holy right to rent has been further perpetuated, this time without any regard as to tenant's actual earnings on the land. The Court there decided that the obligation of a tenant to pay rent after the beginning of the term does not depend on his possession of the demised premises. If he acquired perfect title thereto by virtue of the lease, which would include the right of possession, he is liable for rent under his covenant to pay the same, regardless of whether or not he actually obtained possession.

Thus it is seen that while the definition of rent is vague, and includes the return for the use of tenements and furniture, the Courts have, none the less, insisted that the payment of rent is a natural act, and have in every way enforced it.

To come back to the definitions, we see Professor Easterday cautioning the student to be careful in his use of the word "rent," and yet, in the same passage, he further defines rent as "the right . . . against realty to receive from it some compensation or rent" (*Van Rensselaer v. Read*, 26 N. Y. 558, 564.) He himself has fallen into the error of including in a definition the thing being defined, in this case, *rent*. It is like defining land as consisting of air, water, and land.

The foregoing authorities, in discussing the origin and the definition of rent, are united in the assertion that rent must consist of profit. They do not define what profit is, but use the term in its common meaning, as defined by Henry George: "Profit is the amount received in excess of an amount expended." Now, by what stretch of imagination, legal or otherwise, could it be said that rent is an amount received in excess of an amount expended? What amount was expended to create land?

If it could be claimed that certain individual landlords

have worked as wage-earners nearly all their life, stinting themselves of all pleasures, working, slaving, and saving enough to buy a share of the infinite universe, the answer is that firstly, in political economy, which deals with a community generally, we are not interested in individual transactions, and that as a whole, the class of landlords did not derive its claim to land by exchanging the result of hard labor for real estate. And secondly, were it possible that every landlord today actually did purchase land by means of wealth accumulated at the expense of daily toil, it still would not change the fact that title to that which cannot be owned cannot be passed, irrespective of the good faith or the honestly-possessed wealth of the purchaser. Ironically, the rule just quoted is a legal axiom so thoroughly ingrained in the annals of the law, that it is never even questioned by gentlemen who prattle about legal rent and profits.

Unfortunately, we live in a world where the acceptance of status quo is tantamount to the acceptance of truth, so earnestly searched for by the ancient philosophers. In a world where mental garbage passes for impenetrable—and therefore, deep—thought, all such ambiguity is appreciated, as faithfully summarizing the chaotic nonsense existing in the present order. Scholastic pulpits impress upon us the value of ten-syllable words; lawyers, carefully splitting thin hairs into infinitesimal principles of law, pompously clothe such principles with all the parasitic medals with which this world abounds. Questions like "Are you still beating your wife?" and "How many angels can stand on top of a pin?" are earnestly debated; and the fury exerted to discover who swindled whom in what, trains the mind to waste itself in futile endeavor.

## By-products of Education

By WILLIS A. SNYDER

AT the Henry George Centenary last September, I "scraped acquaintance" with a banker who spoke disparagingly of the effectiveness of the Henry George School extension class he was conducting. Perhaps it has been excessive modesty on my part, but I myself have been so discouraged at the number who break their promises to join our classes, at the number of others who drop out, and even those who "complete" the course and then seem to feel no concern to help spread the doctrine, that I wonder if other Extension Secretaries of the School do not share my sense of frustration.

I have been encouraged to persist partly by the instances of indirect results that have occasionally come to my notice, some of which I would like to pass on for the encouragement of others who may be tempted to abandon their work or deterred from starting a class by the scarcity of tangible results.

An executive in a manufacturing concern eight miles from Hudson, New York (where I teach), who would never attend a class, has bought four copies of our text-book, "Progress and Poverty," to give away. In his office recently I noticed one of the tracts printed by Mr. Goeller that I did not recall giving to him. He said it had come back to him with acknowledgment of a "small contribution" he had made to Gilbert Tucker's group, the Tax Relief Association (I had sent them his name), and that he kept it on his desk "to start arguments with"!

I experienced one of my bitterest disappointments when the social science teacher from the Hudson High School dropped out of my class. A year later I had a chance to tell him that President Knarr of our Henry George Fellowship had recently seen a Cornell University text-book which gave considerable favorable treatment to the Georgeist Philosophy. His reply was, "Why shouldn't they? There are no arguments against it. I teach it as much as the Syllabus will permit."

A local merchant who "had no time" for class borrowed my copy of "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty." He kept it so long that I finally asked him to return it unread so I could lend it to someone else. He stalled and when I finally recovered the book he had read it and said he was convinced that Single Tax would work if it were possible to get it tried.

I could give many more instances of books sold to people whom I unsuccessfully solicited to attend classes at the school. Some were influential people, some were not. Some read the books, others did not. I always have a copy of "Progress and Poverty" in my car and have sold them to all kinds of people in all kinds of places. I hope these facts may encourage some other teacher who is working alone "out in the sticks" where you cannot send out a thousand class announcements to a thousand *new* names twice a year but have to get your pupils by knocking them down and dragging them in. I feel if the class had continued in Albany and the one promised in Poughkeepsie would start, it would not only produce results both tangible and intangible in those cities, but would add to the prestige of my work in Hudson. Every outpost helps, but it is harder to keep up one's courage on the frontiers than where one attends large faculty meetings every few months.

One way we try to get publicity for the Hudson Extension is by exhibits in the windows of vacant stores. I like to think that there may be some intangible propaganda there—that some prejudice against our ideas may be broken down in minds of people we never contact in any other way.

The way of education is a long, slow way, it is a hard struggle. But it is *not* a futile endeavor. The "by-products" that we may never hear of are incalculable. In the work of education the best advice to follow is—haste not, rest not. "Its growth is in other hands."

## Abel Brink

**I**N the death of Abel Brink, early in January, 1940, the movement in Denmark has lost one of its ablest adherents. Of Abel Brink it can indeed be said that he toiled for the Truth, suffered for it, and died for it. Never robust, Brink spent most of his life in fighting for the rights of man. He died in his early fifties after a long illness. His mental and spiritual energy, his power of faith and devotion to the Truth, were too much for his frail body to support any longer.

His interest in political economy dates from his school years. Scarcely twenty when a pupil in Jakob Lange's People's High School (Adult High School), Brink translated an English book on political economy, the effort incidentally affording him an easy way to learn English. He was then planning to come to the United States. Later when he did come to this country, he spent several years on a relative's farm, then returned to Denmark to finish his education and get his University degree. He subsequently entered Government employ, and became a member of the Valuation Commission, interesting himself particularly in Land Valuation. If Denmark today has one of the best land valuation systems in the world, a system that is part of the governmental functions, it is because of Abel Brink's many years of work. He studied the systems in use in other lands. Among the systems he introduced was the Purdy Unit (New York City) system of urban land valuation for Copenhagen and other large towns. He also mapped farm land and did many things to make the government and the people of his country understand the immense importance, as a sound basis for political economy, of a proper understanding of land values.

For over twenty years Mr. Brink has been prominent in the Georgeist work in Denmark. He was a spearhead at all important meetings in his own country and at many a Conference in other lands. A quiet, shy man, a rather dry speaker and writer, the facts he had to tell were nevertheless of great importance. The papers written by him for various conventions would, of themselves, make an enlightening record of the work in Denmark.

For many years Mr. Brink had been editor of *Grundskyld*, the official organ of the Danish Henry George Association, or, as it subtitles itself, the "Association for Ground Debt and Free Trade." Our Danish comrades, incidentally, do not call themselves Single Taxers, but Georgeists. They do not speak of "Single Tax" but have, as the basis of their work and teachings, the words "Ground Debt" (*Grundskyld*, i. e., the debt owed to the community for the use of land).

Abel Brink was as faithful at this work as at all his other labor for the Truth in which he believed. As he was not gifted with the personal magnetism that aids

other workers in the Cause, in Denmark as elsewhere, Brink's influence relied mainly upon the unassailable truth of his argumentation, upon his astounding knowledge of facts, and his ability to marshal them. His keen sense of justice, his unswerving devotion to the Truth burned through his quiet, rather restrained, manner, and made itself felt whenever he spoke and wrote.

The January issue of *Grundskyld* was devoted mainly to tributes to Brink by leading associates, Jakob Lange, veteran of the Danish movement; K. J. Kristensen; F. Folke; J. L. Bjorner and Mrs. Signe Bjorner, as well as many others. His comrades spoke at the funeral ceremony, and a memorial meeting was held by the Henry George Association, in the form of a dinner at the Grundtvig House in Copenhagen. The tone of this meeting, as described in *Grundskyld*, was hopeful and cheerful, as Brink himself would have wished it. The speeches told of his fine work, of the tributes coming from other lands. It was on this occasion that Mr. Folke told of Abel Brink's last wish, his request that the words THE EARTH FOR THE PEOPLE might be carved on his gravestone.

Abel Brink's life, and the prominence he attained in the work for the Truth in which he believed, were a fine example of the power of faith. Lacking, either in appearance or manner, in that personal charm that attracts attention to the individual himself and may outweigh the cause he advocates, Brink worked his way up to a leading position in the Movement by his steadfast faith, his unswerving loyalty, his clear incisive understanding. He will be greatly missed in Denmark as elsewhere where Georgeists meet. And his name will stand high in the ranks of those who remained faithful . . . "even unto death."  
—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON

## Fellow Journeyman

THREE famous men have passed away recently, all within a short time of one another, all distinguished in their respective fields, all friends of the Henry George cause. They are, Raymond V. Ingersoll, Hamlin Garland and Edwin Markham.

It was a useful public career that came to an untimely end with the passing of Raymond Ingersoll, on February 24, 1940, at the age of 65. His interest in public affairs began forty years ago, when he was active in the New York City election which threw out the Tammany mayor, Van Wyck, and brought in Seth Low, who was then President of Columbia University. From 1919 to 1924, Ingersoll was secretary of the influential civic group, the City Club of New York. In 1924, he was selected as Impartial Chairman to arbitrate the labor disputes in the cloak and suit industry. He received wide com-

mendation from all sides for his fair and impartial adjudications. He resigned this post in 1931. In 1933 he was elected President of the Borough of Brooklyn, New York, and was re-elected in 1937. This position he retained, honorably and efficiently, up to his recent death. Though not active in the Georgeist cause, he was known to be very friendly, and was always prepared to lend his aid and influence when called upon to do so. He preferred to be known as a tax reformer rather than a single taxer, but conceded that his entire knowledge of taxation came to him from his study of Henry George.

Hamlin Garland, the "dean of American letters", died March 4, 1940, at the age of 79. He came from a pioneering family, and was born in Wisconsin in its frontier days. His chief sympathies and interests lay with the frontier pioneers, whom he has immortalized in his literary works. His travels took him to Iowa, Dakota, California and the Yukon. He foresaw the defeat of the pioneers in the economic system that was taking hold. Garland's accepted masterpiece, "A Son of the Middle Border" is the story of his own family, and its westward migrations, in the constant driving search for better land on which to settle. Having had the privilege of observing the land question at first hand, Garland was greatly influenced by Henry George. He was a member of the first National Conference of Single Taxers in 1890, and it was he who officiated in welcoming Henry George back to America after his travels abroad.

Our third friend, Edwin Markham, died on March 7, 1940. He would have celebrated his 88th birthday on April 23. Markham was born in Oregon, wrote verses since childhood, and worked on farms and cattle ranches. He lived in obscurity until his 47th year, when the poem that brought him fame was given to the world. "The Man with the Hoe" has been circulated more than any other single poem. Markham said that he was inspired by Millet's painting of the same name, in which the apathetic hoeman did indeed seem to be "bowed by the weight of centuries". "The yeoman," said the poet, "is the landed and well-to-do farmer. You need shed no tears for him. But here, in Millet's picture is his opposite, the hoeman, the landless and soul-blighted workman of the world." Markham's sense of outrage at this economic inequality resolved itself into his poem.

"Plundered, profaned, disinherited,  
Cries protest to the Judges of the World,  
A protest that is also a prophecy."

The founder of LAND AND FREEDOM, Joseph Dana Miller, was one of the first to bring Markham's poem to public attention. While Markham was a prolific writer and lecturer, he has not been able to escape the onus of being a one-poem poet. But he might well have been consoled with the knowledge that no one else ever made a deeper furrow with a mere hoe.

## Signs of Progress

### GEORGEIST ACTIVITIES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

#### Henry George School of Social Science

REPORT OF EDWIN ROSS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

**CLASSES**—At the middle of this spring term there are fifty classes in "Progress and Poverty" being conducted at headquarters, out of an original fifty-one at the beginning of the term. A comparison with previous mid-term data reveals that there has been a smaller percentage of drop-outs this term than ever before.

There are six classes for high school students, and judging from the report of their instructors they are splendid classes. The students evince a disposition towards logical reasoning, and they are less obsessed with pre-conceived notions than are their elders. They require less help from the instructors, and they readily correct themselves when in error. The results of educating this group warrant more attention being paid to them. It is expected that the number of such classes will be increased in ensuing terms.

**STUDENT GROUPS**—A group of students have formed a debating team. To begin with, they will limit themselves to intra-mural debates, and as experience is gained, they expect to branch out. The purpose of the group is to attract the attention of those unacquainted with the philosophy of Henry George, to the end that they will take up the study more thoroughly in classes.

Another student group that has been formed is the Current Events Discussion Group, which meets at the School every Wednesday. Sidney Abelson, who also conducts a writing group, acts as Chairman. Topics of current interest, such as the Finnish loan, the Japanese embargo, and New Deal measures, have been discussed by a group averaging twenty-five in number. Controversial subjects are treated in the manner of a debate, each side being represented by a speaker, with general discussion following.

**EXTENSION CLASSES**—Due mainly to Secretary Teresa McCarthy's intensive efforts in New Jersey, classes are being conducted in Elizabeth, Bloomfield, Perth Amboy, Irvington, Dover, Orange, Newark, Kearny, Montclair, North Arlington, Union City, West New York, Hackensack, Paterson, Pompton Plains, and Lincoln Park.

Most of the big cities in the United States are represented by classes. Among those that have more than one class are: Boston, Mass., with ten classes; St. Louis,

Mo., with five; Philadelphia, Pa., three; Chicago, Ill., twenty-five; Hartford, Conn., five; Long Island, N. Y., seven.

Not all the extensions have reported yet for their Spring term plans. More are expected.

In Boston an unusually large class graduated at a meeting of the Henry George Fellowship held at the Y.W.C.A. John S. Codman was chairman. Francis Goodale delivered the principle address. New classes started April 1. A broadcast over a Boston radio station announced the commencement of these classes.

#### SPEAKERS BUREAU

Dorothy Sara, in charge of the Speakers Bureau of the School, reports that the service of supplying Georgeist speakers to various social groups is a most efficient means of stimulating public interest in the Georgeist philosophy, and in getting people to take the course at the School.

Louis Wallis, noted Georgeist author and lecturer, spoke before the Paterson Rotary Club, in New Jersey, on March 15. Out of eighty-five members present, fifty-eight enrolled on the spot for the correspondence course in Fundamental Economics. The meeting consisted mostly of business men, a type of audience which Mr. Wallis is particularly qualified to handle. His remarks were on "Our Lopsided Taxation", a topic he has often used, always with favorable results.

A new service has been established in the Speakers Bureau. While most speakers deliver their speeches *ex tempore*, some of them write out their speeches, and afterwards place them with the Bureau, thus making them available to others. A file of speeches on a variety of subjects has thus been built up. When some organization wants to hear a talk on housing, or the depression, for instance, the chosen speaker may study and use the speech already written on that topic.

So valuable has the Speakers Bureau in New York City proven, that Extension Schools in other cities have been inspired to start their own lecture service bureaus. Among the cities that have already gotten their bureaus under way are: Newark, N. J.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Berkeley, Calif.; and Montreal, Canada.

## SOCIETY FOR LONG ISLAND GEORGEISTS

The proposed classes of the Society, reported in the last issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, are now in full swing, and arrangements for four new classes in "Progress and Poverty" have since been made.

Besides taking upon himself the large order of covering Long Island with classes, Dr. S. A. Schneidman, leader of the Society, has established a series of forums similar to the ones held at the School headquarters. The Long Island forums are held Tuesday evenings at the Jamaica Y.M.C.A., and the whole series for this Spring has already been planned. Among the lecturers who have already spoken are: Holger Lyngholm, on "Cooperation and Democracy in Denmark" (which appears elsewhere in this issue); Ralph Borsodi, Editor of *Free America* and Director of the School for Living, on "The Doom of the Modern City—Decentralization Program for Social Change"; and Dr. Henry Neumann, leader of the Brooklyn Ethical Culture School, on "Building the Ethical World of Tomorrow". Many more prominent speakers appear on the program for future forums.

A fine statement of the aims of the Society appears in the announcement of the forums: "The Society for Long Island Georgeists is bravely attempting, in these chaotic times, to bring together socially spirited men and women inspired by the teachings of Henry George, that these may in turn help others into an understanding of the possibility of realizing economic democracy—the basis for a meaningful life—in this day and age."

### CHICAGO, ILL.

One of the aims of Oscar Geiger in founding the School was to produce, not only converts to the Georgeist philosophy, but also leaders who would themselves sustain and expand educational activities.

The fact that this aim has borne fruit is well exemplified in the Chicago School. Forty students of the Winter term met at the Chicago headquarters on March 9, to consult on plans for Spring classes, and for the commencement exercises. One of the students suggested that a representative from each class discuss the needs of the School with his fellow students and help support its activities. The suggestion was unanimously accepted.

## Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

### REPORT OF V. G. PETERSON, SECRETARY

**TAXATION TURMOIL**—Readers who enjoyed "Taxation Turmoil" by W. R. B. Willcox, will be pleased to know that the publication has now been taken over by a New York concern and a new edition, now in production, will be available later on this year. For those unfamiliar

with the book, perhaps the best summary is the author's prefacing statement: Mr. Willcox says, "The following pages were written in a spirit of protest against what seems to be a settled policy of those who direct and influence the affairs of government." His answers to the questions of what can replace taxation, who will pay for the government, which of our existing taxes is the most vicious and what class of men is hardest hit by the present system, make up one of the most widely discussed books of contemporary Georgeist literature. The publishers have established a price of \$2 for the new edition and orders may be placed with the Foundation.

**PEARSON'S LONDON**—It has been suggested that we bring to your attention Doctor S. Vere Pearson's excellent study, "London's Overgrowth" (reviewed in the May-June issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*). While treating, as the case in point, the City of London, Dr. Pearson undertakes to answer many of the questions about our own cities that have long perplexed us. The book is a pleasant voyage of exploration into the economic, geographical and cultural forces that combine to establish, develop and maintain the city as a special form of human association, and the understanding which the reader gains sets the problem completely in perspective. Dr. Pearson's inquiry into the part the land question plays in complicating every urban issue, however remotely connected it may seem, is the reader's guide into a realm hitherto reserved for the experts—some of whom have found it expedient to keep the public ignorant and the territory uncharted. The book, a recent import, is available from the Foundation at \$2 a copy, postpaid.

**PAMPHLETEERING ACTIVITIES**—The value of pamphleteering has long been acknowledged, and is bringing results in special work we have been doing this winter among high school teachers of economics. Nearly two hundred copies of "Progress and Poverty" have been purchased by members of this influential group, extra literature for class room use has been requested, and we have reason to believe that, in many high schools, more attention is being paid to George.

A new campaign has just been started among architects of New York State. We are distributing the pamphlet "Why Penalize Building", with a letter pointing out how the building trade and allied industries would benefit by the abolition of taxes on buildings and other improvements.

**FAME MOVES APACE**—Our efforts to have Henry George elected to the Hall of Fame this year, move on apace. Friends who have helped in previous elections are being urged to again put their shoulders to the wheel. New friends who would like to assist are invited to get in touch with us. If you are personally acquainted with

any of the one-hundred-and-fourteen electors whose names have been appearing in the daily press (or a list of whom we can send you), will you please communicate with the Foundation? It will be a great satisfaction to all of us when Henry George receives the recognition due him, and is awarded his place of honor in this American Valhalla.

### Manhattan Single Tax Club

**P**RESIDENT Ingersoll has of late been issuing his current events radio addresses more frequently. His aim is to reach people of average intelligence, and this aim, he says, makes urgent the need for a simple and clear statement of economics. This, he believes is the task ahead of the whole Georgeist movement.

Mr. Ingersoll considers that one reason Georgeists have not made headway with colleges—and with the whole educational system—is their failure to present their economics in a form suitable for distribution (teaching). He follows the business analogy of manufacturing and selling. The Georgeist failure has been in the market place.

Following are extracts from President Ingersoll's recent broadcasts:

ONE OF THE SIGNS THAT OUR FRONTIERS ARE CLOSED BREAKS forth in a big story from California, telling of the spring parade of "jalopies" containing emigrant workers and their families. From fifty to one hundred thousand of these workers enter the state each year and are considered a menace in various ways. I am writing to J. Rupert Mason of California, to inquire whether in his state there is any shortage of land, or whether it is made short by its monopolizers. Our frontiers are closed in many states by half the land being subject to sale for taxes due from broken-down speculators. That amount of land would take care of all our unemployed.

DEMOCRACY IS NO HANDSOMER THAN ARE ITS ACTS. IT IS EVEN more unlovely if it is undemocratic. The Republican Party was in power during the most constructive period of our struggles toward democracy. It would have been logical for them to adopt the democratic program of killing consumer taxes and shifting them onto the basic monopoly, land. They have failed to do this. The Democratic Party might do it if it really knew the meaning of the words "New Deal". So we have to keep shouting from the housetops till one of these parties wakes up to the obvious. If they slumber much longer, they ought to be buried, and a real *democratic* party founded.

IT APPEARS THAT SOME POLITICAL WISDOM IS ABROAD IN THE Democratic camp; and that it may be concentrating upon the economic sector. While Secretary Hull is bent on extending Trade Treaties, there is more than a suspicion that the President is firmly behind him, and has been, during their four years of cooperation. Secretaries Morgenthau and Eccles are covering the more vital principle of domestic free trade. The mere declaration against piling consumer taxes higher is a big step toward democratic economics.

### League for Freedom

REPORT OF JOHN P. FINNERTY, SECRETARY

Mr. Foley's "Appeal for Action" in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM met with an enthusiastic response, and as a result, three meetings have already been held. A society was formed under the name League for Freedom, to bring about the following changes in the laws:

1. The abolition of all taxes of every kind, and the collection of ground rent for government expenses.

2. The restoration of individual rights, the right of every man to live his life free from governmental restrictions and interference; government to be limited to its legitimate province—the protection of individual freedom and the rendering of public service.

The League expects to reach thousands who are now complaining of the restrictions and exactions which are strangling private enterprise. The following plan has been initiated:

1. To enroll existing Georgeists as a nucleus.

2. To form them into active working groups in every district, and to offer a program of work to every member.

3. To coordinate the resources of the League in a concerted effort to enlist the public in restoring human rights.

4. To use all the existing facilities, literature and publications in the Georgeist movement to promote this work.

5. To disseminate the philosophy of freedom everywhere, to everyone, regardless of party, race or creed.

When our membership shall have grown to a number the votes of which will appeal to lawmakers, we shall give support to bills introduced which embody our aims. The very debating on such bills will bring our aims before the public and give us an audience we could secure in no other way.

Dues have been tentatively set at one dollar per year. These dues are entirely voluntary. All who wish to join are asked to send us their names. Pending the establishment of permanent headquarters, please write to the Secretary, League for Freedom, 1351 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

### National Prosperity Legion

Almost simultaneously with the formation of the League for Freedom, a group of Chicago Georgeists have been at work launching a national Georgeist organization, to be known as the National Prosperity Legion. The leaders of this group, Clayton J. Ewing and Thomas Rhodus, have circularized Georgeists throughout the



country, inviting them to help form the organization. A National Convention is being planned, at which programs for action will be taken up.

This group is convinced that the educational method is the most effective. "Truth is mighty and will prevail," they tell us, but continue with the admonition, "but only if those who know the Truth do something about it. Through this militant organization, let us boldly, eagerly and effectively give the World our message."

This suggests a mass education scheme, and it is. The work is to be done through pamphlets, petitions and political action, as well as through the more thorough forms of education that reach only a small number of people.

It would be logical for this group to cooperate with the League for Freedom, and already steps have been taken towards this. For those who may be interested, the address is: National Prosperity Committee, 5307 Ravenswood Ave., Chicago, Ill.

### Alaska

The first issue of *Frontier* (mentioned in the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation report in the last number of LAND AND FREEDOM) has reached us. This latest Georgeist publication is edited and published by Jim Busey. It appears to be even more ambitious than we thought. Instead of being a bi-monthly, as was originally intended, the first issue, dated February, 1940, is announced as a monthly, to be "devoted to Alaska, to Alaska's problems, and to the freedom for which Alaska stands."

*Frontier* has thirty-two pages chock full of informative articles and vital Alaskan affairs of the day. Among the articles is Donald MacDonald's "Stagnation of Alaska", in which he exposes the land grabs of that territory which robbed the workers of free access to the mines and other resources. Another article is "Scandinavia and Alaska", by Mr. Busey, which is an interesting comparative survey, geographic and economic.

Why the name "Frontier" for this publication? Mr. Busey explains in his editorial:

"The word 'frontier' stands for more than simply a new pioneering country. A frontier means freedom. It is a place where free men, working on their own free land with their own hands, mould for themselves their own future, according to their own ambitions.

"Thus, a frontier is a place where there is no limit to the imagination, the hopes, the ambitions and the possibilities of a man. The frontier stands as the eternal emblem of progress, liberty, and equality.

"That is why we chose the name FRONTIER."

Jim Busey is a man with vision. We consider the venture worthwhile and deserving of support. The subscription rate of *Frontier* is \$2.00 a year, and the present address is Anchorage, Alaska.

### Argentine

A Georgeist paper is published at Buenos Aires, by Juan Bellagamba. It is called *Nueva Argentina*, and is a four-page bi-weekly, in the format of a newspaper. Articles on the Georgeist philosophy are presented newspaper-like, with headlines, in a form likely to attract public attention. One of the articles recently printed was a Spanish translation of Oscar H. Geiger's "Sex Problem", under the heading, "El sexo no es un problema".

Another very interesting article in a recent issue of *Nueva Argentina* was by Dr. Ignacio E. Ferrer on the fiscal system of Cordoba, a province in Argentine. Cordoba's governor, Amadeo Sabattini, maintains the reform introduced by his predecessor Carcano, a high tax on land values and low taxes on buildings, labor and industry. Of course, the great landowners denounce it as a "demagogic and pernicious confiscation", but in his article, Dr. Ferrer brilliantly answers the arguments of the opposition.

One of the editors of *Nueva Argentina* is Dr. Felix Vitale, noted author. Last year, Dr. Vitale wrote an article on the land values taxation movement in South America. This was intended for presentation at the Henry George Centenary, held at New York last September, but unfortunately it did not arrive in time.

### Canada

THE SCHOOL SCENE—The Canadian Henry George Schools at Toronto and Montreal are keeping abreast of the School in the United States. Montreal has opened a Speakers Bureau similar to the one in New York City. In the classes, not only the Fundamental Economics course is offered, but advanced courses as well. And now correspondence courses are being offered. There is one feature about this that is ahead of the New York School. While only the "Progress and Poverty" course is given to correspondence students in the United States, in Toronto correspondence courses are also extended to "Protection or Free Trade", "Social Problems", "The Science of Political Economy", and "Democracy Versus Socialism".

ONTARIO WAKING UP—The January-February issue of *The Square Deal*, Toronto Georgeist bi-monthly, carries an interesting article reporting the steps which the Ontario legislature has taken to deal with the unemployment problem. We quote from this article:

"Owners of unused land in Ontario will be required to forego the privilege of keeping their land idle from now on, for legislation has been passed empowering the Director of Unemployment Relief to put garden plots at the disposition of unemployed families on relief beginning from this spring. Nor are the relievees the only ones entitled to cultivate idle land, for municipalities

are also authorized to declare such unused land as they may designate available for cultivation and anyone may make application, upon payment of a fee, not to exceed one dollar, to cultivate a garden plot.

"One feature of the legislation is that a landowner who cannot prove to the satisfaction of the authorities that he is going to make his land productive either by erecting a building on it within the year, or by other use, must allow his land to be used, and cannot claim any compensation for its use. At the same time he has to pay the taxes assessed upon the land, even though he gets no revenue from what may be grown on his land. For the cultivators are to be entitled to everything that they grow.

"In the case of those on relief, it is mandatory that they shall apply for a plot and cultivate it, but there is to be no reduction in the amount of their vouchers because of such additional income. The idea is that their labor shall supplement public relief and that any increase in the cost of living, entailing shrinkage in the purchasing power of vouchers, will be thereby compensated. The public authority will provide seed, fertilizer, small tools and shanties for storing them, supervision and caretaking of the plots, and will do the first ploughing and breaking up of virgin soil."

### Great Britain

A MISCONCEPTION CORRECTED—The Editors of *Land and Liberty* wish to correct a notion prevalent among Americans with respect to the British Government's war-time power to confiscate all property except land. The Emergency Powers Act reads: "Defence Regulations may . . . authorize (i) the taking of possession or control, on behalf of His Majesty, of any property or undertaking; (ii) the acquisition, on behalf of His Majesty, of any property other than land."

*Land and Liberty* explains this provision as follows:

"The Regulation means that the Government may take possession or control of any property including land; but that in taking power *to acquire*, that is to purchase, any property, land is excepted. This is a wise precaution because it will obviate any large scale land purchases at the monopoly prices which the Government would be bound to pay. It prevents what might have been a huge land racket, if owners had been able to demand payment of the market price by the Government. Where it is a question of taking possession of land for defence purposes, the only compensation the Government need pay is the rent which the owners are now deriving from it. When the land is no longer required for defence purposes it will revert to the owner, and nothing will have happened to prevent the operation of land value

taxation, when that does take effect, applying to land holdings everywhere."

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES—The Henry George Foundation of Great Britain has recently printed two new pamphlets: "The Real Meaning of Free Trade" and "The Future is to the Gangster—Unless", which latter contains Henry George's "Rights of Man". These are offered at a special rate in quantities to those who can effectively use them in select groups and organizations.

Spring classes of the Henry George Schools have gotten under way at Glasgow, Yorkshire and Liverpool, as well as at London. Mr. W. E. Fox, School leader at Battersea, is also Minister in the local Battersea "Parliament", where he introduced a Bill for the Taxation of Land Values on February 29.

### Australia

GEORGEIST BOOK CLUB—The Australian proponent of the Liberty Readers' Book Club (to which considerable attention was given in the last issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*), under the pen-name of "Libertas", has recently circularized Georgeist publications throughout the world to give the matter earnest and urgent attention. "The Book Club", he says, "when established, will furnish yet another pillar of the Georgan edifice in the realm of practical application of the Georgan method." The *Standard*, of Sydney, which was the first to call the proposal to the attention of Georgeists, in its February 15 issue made another appeal for the formation of the Club. It warned Georgeists that the movement "has allowed such organizations as the Left Book Club to hold the field without putting forward a sufficient stream of counter-availing literature to offset the flood of false and harmful theory the people so eagerly read in the absence of the truth. That is the cause for the Liberty Readers' Book Club."

NATIONAL CONFERENCE—An Australian National Conference, convened by the New South Wales School of Social Science, was held at Newport, N. S. W., January 19 to 22. Many delegates were present from nearly all the Australian States. Different aspects of the Georgeist philosophy were discussed, and plans for action were considered. As a supplement to the information supplied in the speeches at this Conference, the Editor of the *People's Advocate* presented a world-wide survey of the progress made towards land value taxation in various countries. This paper required much research and is an important contribution, since much of the information is not ordinarily available.

The School of Social Science, with a greatly increased impetus arising out of the Conference, commenced new courses. The Australian School now also offers correspondence courses, and is the latest country to do so.

## The Fame of Emperor Norton

IN the last issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, Jos. W. Foley contributed an interesting bit of research in his article "Bummer and Lazarus". In it Mr. Foley expressed regret that the hero of the story, Joshua Abraham Norton (who thought he was Emperor of America), was not mentioned in the works of Henry George. An additional bit of research reveals that George did mention him.

In one of his newspaper features, "Strange as it Seems", John Hix mentions an eccentric San Francisco character known as Abraham "Money" King. Accused by one John Cook, a tax collector, of being a miser, "King challenged the tax collector to a 'money duel' to prove that money meant nothing to him. He proposed to toss \$5 into San Francisco Bay for every dollar John Cook would toss in. By the time King had flipped 80 'cartwheels' into the water, Cook reluctantly admitted defeat." This incident, readers will recall, is mentioned in Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" in the discussion on labor unions in Book VI.

Upon our inquiry, Mr. Hix has assured us that "Money" King was the same character as "Emperor" Norton.

Another interesting article on Norton appeared in the *American Magazine* of February 25. In this article, the story of how Norton lost his fortune is different from Mr. Foley's version. "In 1853," the *American* story goes, "he became eagerly speculative and tried to gain control of the rice market. He bought heavily to effect a corner and capitalists applauded him for his daring. He seemed on the verge of an immense fortune in profits and he built extravagant dreams. Almost the last pound of rice in port had been purchased. Then came the blow. Two unexpected shiploads of rice arrived from China. Norton and his newly-formed company could not take them up and were almost ruined. The shock of disappointment was a blow to his sanity."

If this is the true story of how Norton lost his fortune, it might well have been used by Henry George "to illustrate many of his points," as Mr. Foley suggests. It is a good example of the impermanency of monopoly in the products of labor. Wealth, not being limited in quantity, does not permit of being cornered. Had Norton the foresight to seize control of the limited source of wealth, land, the story might have been a different one. Instead of losing his sanity, and imagining he was Emperor of America, he might have in fact become a real one.

But nevertheless, Norton's fame is on the increase. There is a plan afoot to erect a statue to his memory in San Francisco. Would that that city were equally ready to pay tribute to the sanity of its prophet, Henry George!

## BOOK REVIEWS

### JOHN DEWEY'S SOCIAL APPROACH

"The Philosophy of John Dewey", Edited by Paul Arthur Schilpp. Northwestern University, Evanston and Chicago. 1939. 708 pp. \$4.00.

This imposing tome is Volume I. of an ambitious project, to be known as "The Library of Living Philosophies". The purpose is to present an adequate survey of the thought of leading contemporary philosophers. John Dewey has been honored first, as America's foremost philosopher.

The work follows a certain plan of presentation (as will the others to come): A biography of the philosopher; a series of expositions and criticisms of the philosopher by leading thinkers; a rejoinder by the philosopher himself; and a bibliography of his writings. Among the contributors to this volume are Bertrand Russell, George Santayana, Alfred N. Whitehead, Joseph Ratner, and George Raymond Geiger, each one writing on some particular phase of Dewey's philosophy.

Dr. Geiger's subject is "Dewey's Social and Political Philosophy". While some of the other contributors have criticized Dewey adversely, Geiger has offered an appreciative exposition of Dewey's stand on social affairs. In his introductory remarks, Geiger reiterates the challenge to philosophy that has appeared in his earlier works, notably "The Philosophy of Henry George". The modern philosopher, he says, must become part of the life about him and tackle its problems, if he is to serve a useful purpose in society.

Geiger further points out that Dewey's philosophy is chiefly one of social approach. This he explains as a function of his experimentalism and instrumentalism. Dewey is one who would apply the scientific method to social affairs. The true scientific spirit "stands for provisionalism and reconstruction, reliance upon working hypotheses."

Another of Dewey's chief tenets in his entire philosophy is the stressing of "interaction" or "association". Though he would steer away from the concept of immutable natural law, he is compelled to state that "association in the sense of combination is a 'law' of everything known to exist." The apostrophic treatment of the word "law" is an expression of the aversion on the part of most modern philosophers to the concept of natural law. This attitude is almost as dogmatic as the one-time arrogant attitude of "assertion without analysis". It would seem that when a universal condition has been observed and tested, there should be no objection to calling it a natural law.

But this avoidance of absolute concepts serves a healthy purpose in some things. For instance, grand abstractions like the State have no meaning for Dewey. "Public acts require officials and administration. This is the locus of the state." It is merely "a functioning arm of public activity instead of a mystical power worthy of worship."

In Dewey's analyses, new and fresh meanings are given to "democracy" and "liberalism"—words that are so carelessly rolled about these days. In his own sense, he is a democrat and a liberal. He demands a free and democratic society, in which philosophic inquiry into social affairs can function—a society in which "free social inquiry is indissolubly wedded to the art of full and moving communication." He has no use for totalitarian concepts, nor for Marxian dialectic, because of their deadening effects on the inquiring spirit, because of their metaphysical and absolute approach to social affairs.

In Dewey's own rejoinder, in this book, he gives an appreciation of Dr. Geiger's paper. In his remarks he says: "It cannot be denied that in our social life a great unbalance has resulted because the method of intelligent action has been used in determining the physical conditions that are causes of social effects, whereas it has hardly been tried in determination of social ends and values."

It may be added that here is the basis of Dewey's appreciation of, and favorable disposition toward, Henry George's philosophy. George has fused his keen analysis of social forces with a constructive concern for social ends and values. He tells us not only what is wrong, but what to do about it for our own good.

R. C.

### THE BATTLE AGAINST HEREDITARY PRIVILEGE

"The Ending of Hereditary American Fortunes" by Gustavus Myers. Julian Messner, Inc., New York. 1939. 395 pp. \$3.50.

In this book, Gustavus Myers adds a valuable research contribution to his previous work. The value and importance of Myers' work rests mainly in the mass of documentary proof which he lists in support of his statements. Only a person accustomed to research can fully appreciate the tremendous labor involved in the study of original sources of information evidenced in the preparation of this book.

The theme is the history of the struggle in America, from era to era, against inequalities, particularly against inequality of power and position conferred in law by accident of birth.

Two laws of feudal origin, primogeniture and entail, brought to this country from Europe in connection with early Colonial land grants furnished the battlefield prior to the American Revolution for those fighting for liberty and equality. Primogeniture vested ownership of great landed properties in the eldest son to the exclusion of daughters and younger sons. Entail kept the estate intact from generation to generation and from century to century. The arguments of Thomas Jefferson and others to abolish these two bulwarks of landed aristocracy and the character of the opposition are well portrayed in the book. Pennsylvania (1776), North Carolina (1784), Georgia (1789), Massachusetts (1784), New Jersey (1780, 1784), New York (1786), South Carolina (1791) in turn abolished perpetuities in land holding. States later admitted to the Union were free from the perpetual grip of the dead hand. By about the year 1830 most of the great estates in America had vanished. With the abolition of hereditary title went also the hereditary prerogative of holding office, which, while not fixed in the statute law, had all the force of unbroken custom. Rotation in office under the pressure of democratic forces became the rule.

Common school education for the masses destroyed another age-old birth privilege which limited education to the well born.

The author points out that while this battle against hereditary privilege was being won as to land tenure, another form of perpetuity was coming in, that is, corporation charters for banks, land schemes and other enterprises.

The right to vote, formerly limited to men owning real estate of a prescribed value, became more universal after a long fight against the resistance of propertied opponents.

Assaults on the hereditary transmission of wealth came into the open in 1829 by a resolution adopted by the Workingmen's Party in New York City "that the first appropriation of the soil of the State to private and exclusive possession was eminently and barbarously unjust. That it was substantially feudal in character, inasmuch as those who received enormous and unequal possessions were *lords* and those who received little or nothing were *vassals*." Having made this timely and pertinent approach, understood then by everybody, the resolutions went on to press the main point: "That hereditary transmission of wealth, on the one hand, and poverty on the other, has brought down to the present generation all of the evils of the feudal system, and that, in our opinion, is the prime source of all our calamities."

The slavery question, another issue arising from accident of birth, occupied the mind of America during the generation preceding the Civil War. The movement for an income tax from 1861 to the present,

the growth of the power of the railroads, the economic dictatorship of the "Trusts", Populism, Labor Unions, each find their place in the swing of events up to the opening of the present century. Pen pictures of the contrasts between the extravagant follies of descendants who acquired control of great fortunes by "accident of birth" and the destitution of the children of the poor from whose labor those fortunes are extracted, appear throughout the volume.

The transition of the United States Senate from a "Millionaires' Club" to that of a popularly elected democratic body is dramatically told. The movement for inheritance taxes and gift taxes as a means of revenue and breaking up of great estates is traced with interesting results.

In conclusion the author points to the abolition of inheritances above moderate amounts as a remedy. As to great hereditary wealth he asks: "Why not definitely abolish it as a statutory right? And at the same time completely recast laws so as to prohibit trusts for heirs and all other devices allowing transmission of large fortunes?"

It is quite apparent that the author sees that the foundation of hereditary fortunes rests upon manipulation and control of the nation's natural resources and in monopolies and special privileges granted by law. The book also makes it plain that in spite of the passage of statute law tending to break up hereditary fortunes—primogeniture, entail, slavery, corporation trusts—the fact remains that great fortunes have increased and the lot of the average man has become more precarious as our Republic has advanced.

Students of Henry George will recognize that the remedy lies in preventing the wrongful appropriation of wealth in the processes of production and distribution rather than to wait as it were until the death of the robber and then attempt to recover some part of the proceeds of theft that he may perchance have left behind.

WALTER FAIRCHILD.

### PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

"My Story—Englishman by Birth, American by Adoption", by Edward Barker. 1940. 25 pp.

The author relates his early admiration for American democracy while he was still in England, and his migration to America, the land of promise. Thrilled at first, then greatly disillusioned and saddened by the spectacle of unemployment and depressions, he emerges with his faith in democracy unshaken. He sees the solution to America's problems in an extension of democracy, in the adoption of the philosophy of Henry George.

"Business is Business", by Louis B. Ward. 1939. 18 pp.

This is an attack on the dogma of self-sufficiency and a plea for free trade. After a keen statistical analysis of our export trade, the author says:

"America is not self-sufficing. Three courses are open to her. First, she must become self-sufficing, which means a new imperialism if she is to continue to use such things as tin, rubber and silk. Second, she must find substitutes for these things. Third, she must learn to trade with the nations of the world."

"The Non-Producing Class", by William O'Neill. 14 pp. 1940.

The author seems to combine Veblenism with Georgeism, and there is also a touch of Marxian dialectic, although Henry George is the only authority quoted in the pamphlet. It is a brief survey of the rise of social consciousness, and the reactionism of non-producers. The author sees a new era approaching in which the common good will prevail over the unsocial lust for power still prevalent. He closes with an affirmation of faith in the power of education.

## Correspondence

### FREE TRADE DISCUSSION

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

A letter from Rev. D. C. McTavish, Telfordville, Alberta, Canada, says: "It was 'protection' that cost England the loss of her American colonies. The same cause was behind the world war of a quarter century ago, and is behind the present unspeakable debacle." Secretary Hull recognizes this, and should be encouraged.

San Francisco, Calif.

J. RUPERT MASON.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I wish to take issue with Peter D. Haley's statements in his Con, in the free trade discussion appearing in your last number. The declaration that "tariffs have nothing to do with our relation to the land" is untrue. As Henry George himself says, "the tariff question is but another phase of the land question".

It is not true that conditions for the working masses were better in protectionist Germany than in Free Trade England previous to the war of '14. During the Free Trade era in England wages were constantly higher than in any other European country. In Germany, socialized control made it possible for a man to starve to death in a sanitary way. That was all.

The expansion of industry subsequent to the passage of the repeal of the Corn Laws and the relief by higher wages and increased opportunity was one of the most striking things in English, if not world, history. I doubt whether there has ever been a similar expansion. Mr. Haley's doctrine that "trade is the food which feeds the maw of rent collectors," is not appreciated by the British landlords, who as a class are about as acutely conscious of their privileges and how to protect them as any that ever existed. They seem always to play a brand of ball that is a little too fast for us. And so it is a fact that utterly unconscious of this Maw dictum they opposed Cobden and Bright in the repeal of the Corn Laws and the present landlord parliament as practically its first act put England on a Protectionist basis.

"The Tariff," says the Con author again, "has nothing to do with man's relationship to the land." I refer him to the files of *Land and Liberty* of London as to the increase in land values barring men from the land that has occurred since England's partial free trade has been abandoned. I refer him also to the rise in prices of every article of consumption, particularly food, since that savage backward step was taken. Tariffs of course cut men off from the rest of the earth outside as well as within their own boundaries.

It should be apparent that the effect of a protective tariff is to restrict production of those goods that are "protected," thus increasing the demand for these lands and increasing rents and land values. A spurious form of land values based on a kind of bastard speculative rent can be obtained through obstructive monopoly-creating laws, and the protective tariff is one of these. That is the reason the landlord Parliament—quite conscious that international trade is *not* the food that feeds the maw of the rent collector—rescinded partial free trade. They of course as usual "knew their onions" as they always have, and very intimately. They of course were acutely conscious that when the production of basic food stuffs, etc., was confined to the soil of England their land values would be raised. They made one error though in their hard-boiled thinking. It was no accident nor was it due to purely sentimental motivation that England had most of the World on her side in the Great War. The hard economic fact that Britain's trade relations with the world were free, and that the tendrils of free trade had penetrated all nations, had a large part in the united support the world gave her.

This war is obviously different. Allies do not flock to the standard of Britain. The world looks at her battle for "Freedom" with a cautious eye. The alienation of her potential allies by a protective tariff has been a large factor in the shifting of good will to suspicion.

As a matter of fact, free trade is as much a part of the Georgan philosophy as the removal of any other taxes on labor made products. I am inclined to believe that it is probably the most important phase of our movement, as it opens the whole Earth to mankind. It is the only way that we in the United States could attack—through joint free trade—spurious land values, with their distortion of the economic structure, in other countries than our own. It is only through free trade that we can draw freely upon the resources of the world beyond our own boundaries.

As an instance of what I am driving at, I relate the following: The sixteen landlords who, through the ownership of about fifty million acres of timber land, dominate the economic structure of the Pacific Coast, succeeded in passing a law taxing the importation of Canadian logs. Some of these outfits had mills of their own and wished a monopoly for them. Of course, after it was impossible to obtain logs from Canada, the price to the independent non-landowning saw-mill operator went up, and so did the price of timber lands. The independents, except in a few instances disappeared. In the face of this, can anyone say that the tariff is no part of the land question?

The most important aspect of free trade is its capacity as a Peacemaker. Henry George and all other economists of note agree that free trade is a necessary foundation for peace. The sum total of what we are forced to pay through all kinds of taxation for war is far greater than the whole of economic rent in these United States. If free trade would solve the problem of war or contribute to that solution it would remove from the back of labor a burden even greater than the sum total of economic rent. Thus it is apparent that free trade is just as important to our philosophy as the land question itself. Free trade *is* one phase of the land question.

Washington, D. C.

DONALD MACDONALD.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Secretary Hull's program of reciprocal trade treaties is by far the best thing the present national Administration has brought forth, although it is such a puny and inadequate proposal that it does not arouse great enthusiasm in me. Its chief value lies in the opportunity it affords for real free traders to get a nation-wide audience before which they can present the merits of full commercial freedom, and for this I am devoutly thankful.

The Con of Free Trade, by Peter D. Haley, seems to me a case of the trees obscuring the forest. Does Mr. Haley regard production as one thing and trade as another thing, instead of being merely "mentally separable parts of the same thing", the industry by which mankind gets its living from the earth? Restraint of one inevitably means restraint of the other. The freedom of *both*, from the artificial restraints which have been imposed upon them, is necessary in order to achieve complete economic freedom, and Mr. Haley errs in thinking that the freeing of trade in itself is valueless. Protection is an important rampart protecting land monopolization, and it must be removed before economic freedom can be attained.

In his day Henry George properly stressed the rise in the rental value of land, which was absorbing the benefits of material progress. Taxation in this country was then comparatively small—only in its infancy—and capitalization of the unearned increment grew rapidly. In 1879, when "Progress and Poverty" was first published, the entire revenue of the Federal government was a scant \$318,000,000, and state and local taxation was also relatively small. Today the naval bill before Congress calls for more than three times that sum, while the mere interest on the national debt of about forty-five billion dollars calls for more than a billion dollars, even though present interest rates are unprecedentedly low.

Mr. Haley must know that it has been estimated by competent investigators that taxes are absorbing 25 per cent or more of the nation's earnings, that taxes on the products and processes of industry and trade constitute 25 to 30 per cent of the cost and price of the things comprising our standard of living. He should know that tariff taxes rank high among the taxes which enhance the cost and price of goods. Surely he knows that the whole vicious system of misplaced and larcenous taxes must be swept away, and the burden of the public revenue placed where it rightfully belongs—on the socially created rental value of the land. Certainly, he ought to know that, however desirable it may be to get rid of the whole thievish tax system all at once, we cannot do it that way. We must attack it wherever we can, and if the opportunity presents itself to attack the tariff, we should not let it go by.

Delawanna, N. J.

STEPHEN BELL.

### NIGHTINGALE VS. BECKWITH

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. L. D. Beckwith of Stockton, California, is never done with attacking "Single Taxers" of the "Old School", and challenging their theories and methods. These charges have, in large measure, been ignored, but the time has now arrived when we "Old Timers" should defend ourselves against, (1) the calling of offensive names, e.g., "Marxians", (2) the assertion that we have not advanced since 1897, and (3) against fallacies propounded by Mr. Beckwith.

As for point No. 1, I have been for 50 years, and more, an active worker in the Cause having for its object the State Collection of Rent, the Repeal of all Taxation, and the restoration of Free Trade conditions. Because I also hold that under the operation of this policy, interest (on investments) will die a natural death, I am branded by Mr. Beckwith as a Marxian! The claim is that Marx opposed interest, therefore (whatever my grounds for opposing it) I am necessarily a Marxian. Now Beckwith and Marx agree on some points (I will prove this if called upon to do so), therefore Beckwith himself is a Marxian! This is very poor logic.

As for No. 2, the fact is that all the "Old Timers", and the new timers for that matter, repudiate some of George's theories, amongst others his theory of interest, and this shows that Mr. Beckwith is again in error. What Georgian today supports Henry George in drawing a distinction between interest on "dead" capital and interest on "live" capital? George said that if interest had to do only with such things as planks and planes, "interest would be but the robbery of industry" (Progress and Poverty, page 129). As regards that theory I venture to say that all of the "Old Timers" have advanced since 1897.

Now for No. 3. Beckwith holds that land has not, and cannot have, any value. This I can refute with Euclidian precision, in 56 words as follows:

Brown goes to an island and makes a good living by using a portion of the land. Jones follows and finds he can only make a poor living by using the other land available to him. The difference between these two standards of living is RENT. Yet there are no social services rendered at the locations.

The simple and inescapable truth is that there are two factors in RENT, (a) services rendered at the location, (b) the natural quality, contour, climatic and other conditions, which give value to the land itself. These advantages may be obtained by the user of the land regardless of whether there are roads, railways, markets, fire services, police protection, water supply, sewerage, or any of the social services that community life calls forth. Let Mr. Beckwith deal with the Brown-Jones illustration above—if he can!

Another question relates to the step-by-step method of State Collection of Rent. Mr. Beckwith states dogmatically that this plan is impossible, or at best impracticable. Again he is in error. We know, of course, that if a fixed percentage is written off the depreciating balance of an asset the asset value never entirely disappears. But merchants and business men (and I might add accountants, and I am one) know quite well that there is no difficulty in writing off the full value of any asset by the instalment system. All that is necessary is to calculate your percentage on the original, or full value, and this could be done in the case of land just as well as it can be done, and is done, in the case of plants or buildings. Again Mr. Beckwith is in error.

Auckland, New Zealand.

C. H. NIGHTINGALE.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Rogelio Casas Cadilla's article, "The Economy of Spain" calls to mind a news item in the *New York Times* of March 7: "Spain Orders Return of Land to Grandees". The peasants now on the land are to be allowed "to remain voluntarily as tenant farmers by paying a government approved compensation to the landowners". Although the distribution of land among the peasants by the Spanish Republic may have merely resulted in a multiplication of landlords, yet this step is still worse.

Malvern, Pa.

ELLEN WINSOR.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

The article by George C. Winne, in the January-February issue, "Single Tax—A Misnomer", is very good, and I thoroughly agree with him. George's philosophy is a way of living, not a tax. His remedy to collect the economic rent produced by the combined work of society, to pay for our social services, is so simple once it is understood, that hesitation to accept it seems ridiculous.

Irvington, N. J.

ROBERT BLACKLOCK.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I would like to submit the following:

Land and its use is the foundation of our civilization.

Land and its use is the paramount economic problem of all time.

Land, sunshine and moisture constitute the source and sustenance of all life.

Land is the only natural element that is commercialized.

Land was created by, and belongs to, the Creator and to no one else.

Land and its possession is the principle cause of war and crime.

Land is the source of all wealth.

But land values are caused by, and increase with, the growth of the community, and should be drawn upon for the support of the community, to the exclusion of other taxes.

We cannot have a free country or free men as long as we permit private property in land.

Roslindale, Mass.

WALTER A. VERNEY.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

The utter indifference of American Single Taxers to electoral reform cuts a deep rift between them and British Colonial Single Taxers. But the most indifferent must be moved by the reduction of one-half in the New York City crime rate since it has had for the very first time a decently honest electoral system in the Council. Above all, the great reaction in favor of Tammany last autumn (not regrettable) has left two-fifths of all the defeated leaders to form a strong and vigilant opposition. This is a blessing and shows the ethical value of Direct Legislation.

Bishops Stortford, England.

(Rev.) MERVYN J. STEWART.

## EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

After reading the interesting, if not very encouraging article by Hon. Jackson H. Ralston in your January-February issue, and especially noting his question or questions concerning future measures and points of attack, an old thought recurred to me. The oldest and most important answer is "Education." Educate the masses. We must keep at it persistently.

Whoever doubts this statement can try a simple experiment on a few dozen of his friends as opportunity offers. Merely ask the question: "Is ground rent an unearned income?" Try it on business men, professional men, high school or college graduates, or on their teachers and professors.

You may have to explain briefly that there are only three true incomes, rent, wages and interest; and that wages and interest are earned incomes. In suitable cases it could be explained that the use of the unearned income to pay public expenses would reduce the worry of the harrassed taxpayer, and reduce time and expense of figuring out income tax returns. My vote is for Education.

Oshkosh, Wisc.

JOHN HARRINGTON.

## EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I noted Mr. Foley's "Appeal for Action" in the January-February LAND AND FREEDOM, and would like to suggest as a starter in getting our people closer together that LAND AND FREEDOM print the street addresses of correspondents. I, for one, feel like writing to many of them, and I think that some of them could use the information in my tracts.

I notice also, that mention was made of my tracts in the last issue, but no address was included, so that readers would not know where to send for them.

Box 105, Endwell, N. Y.

C. LEBARON GOELLER.

NOTE: In response to Mr. Goeller's request, we do not feel at liberty to print the addresses of all our correspondents, except when they permit or request it. Mr. Goeller's address appears above, for those who want to communicate with him directly. We suggest that if any of our readers wish to correspond with those who write for LAND AND FREEDOM, they address their communications to the person they want to contact, care of LAND AND FREEDOM. We will gladly forward the communication to the desired party.—ED.

## EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

It is easy to agree with the Editor of *The American City* and with Mr. Theron McCampbell that, under present unnatural conditions at least, "the land value tax would not give us enough revenue".

But what warrant is there for believing that, under proper conditions, and proper demands for revenue—and with the elimination of the improper demands for relief, relief work, subsidy of non-production, etc.—the rent of the nation's land would be inadequate to meet the needs for public revenue?

Yet another thing is to be considered. Land values are much lower than they ought to be, because of the depressed condition of the nation's business. In addition to the tie-up due to land monopoly, there are the constantly increasing taxes as well as restraints and "regulations" imposed on productive enterprises, all tending to bring on a paralysis. Eliminate these burdens and watch the rent of land mount to its proper level!

Nor will the rise of ground rent represent a mortgage on the nation's earnings, as taxes do. It will represent the growing value of economically free and prosperous communities as places in which to live and work. We might then very likely see rent, wages and interest all advancing in harmonious unison.

Passaic, N. J.

RICHARD RING.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

## GOODBYE, MR. BARNES

Our readers may have noticed the slightly different appearance of this issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, incidental to engaging the services of a new typographer. The occasion is appropriate for saying a few words about our retiring printer, Polydore Barnes. For nearly forty years, "Dory," as he is affectionately called, has personally supervised the composition and press work of this journal. Modest, good-natured and unfailingly cooperative, he has been in the truest sense of the word a part of LAND AND FREEDOM. He has now announced his retirement from the cares of business. We wish him all good fortune.

RALPH BORSODI, who spoke at Dr. Schneidman's forum in Jamaica, N. Y., and is to speak at the Henry George School forum, claims inspiration from Henry George and Bolton Hall for his ideas on the School for Living. This is a back-to-the-land movement being carried out at Suffern, N. Y.

ELIZABETH MAGIE PHILLIPS of Arlington, Va., and William W. Newcomb of New York City, have been collaborating on the idea of spreading the Georgeist philosophy through parlor games. Mrs. Phillips writes:

"I have no trouble getting players. I live near a school and a lot of the children know me personally, and bring their friends in to play. They play such good games that I like to watch them. They play much better than grown-ups. After all, we Georgeists want to make more Georgeists, and it's easier with children than with grown-ups. The thinking machinery of the latter seems to be fixed."

Mrs. Phillips has brought out a new miniature edition of her famous Landlord's Game at the low price of four for fifty cents. Those interested may write to her at 2309 N. Custis Rd., Arlington, Va.

THE March, 1940 issue of *Dynamic America* carries an article by Harold S. Bottenheim and William W. Newcomb on "Taxation and Housing", with illustrations by Robert Clancy. It is in the form of a dialogue between a landlord and his tenant.

JACKSON H. RALSTON is now at work on an enlargement and development of his work, "Democracy's International Law", which was published some years ago.

RALPH CHADWICK has passed away. Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, who sent us this news, writes:

"Mr. Chadwick was one of the ablest and most single-hearted workers in the Single Tax cause in Southern California. He possessed a thorough understanding of the subject and wielded a trenchant pen, being as well an accomplished speaker. In the recent California campaign he was a most efficient worker, although then suffering from ill-health. The death of Ralph Chadwick is a real blow to the cause."

THE *Timely News-Topic*, a weekly published at Dunkirk, N. Y., runs a series of articles written by Robert McCaig, under the title, "The Economy Corner". Mr. McCaig, a Georgeist, discusses such subjects as the farm question, socialism, taxation, and housing.

DR. I. PASTEINER, General Director of the University Library of Budapest, Hungary, is preparing a World List of Periodicals, and is including LAND AND FREEDOM. Recognition also comes from the International Institute of Social History at Amsterdam, Holland, which has requested copies of LAND AND FREEDOM for their archives.

FREDERICK L. CRANFORD, Brooklyn civic leader and Georgeist, died March 28 at the age of 71. Mr. Cranford was a subway contractor, and chairman of the Long Island Ten-Year Plan Committee. He was praised by the late Raymond V. Ingersoll as "one of the most valuable citizens Brooklyn has had."

# International Conference Papers

Presented at the Henry George Centenary  
Celebration in New York, September, 1939

**Nineteen Interesting, Factual Papers of Lasting  
Interest, on the Economic Situation in General,  
and Land Value Taxation in Particular,  
Throughout the World.**

A Boston member of the Conference writes to  
the International Union in London as follows:

May I congratulate you, and congratulate  
the members also, on your enterprise in  
publishing the Conference Papers in so  
convenient and attractive a form? Any  
member of the Union, in fact any disciple  
of Henry George anywhere in the world,  
who is deprived of this collection is miss-  
ing inspiration and encouragement he can-  
not at this time afford to be without. This  
sheaf of facts and ideas constitutes a prize  
package I, personally, value beyond words.  
While every paper was thoughtful, valu-  
able, and convincing in its assigned field,  
the one which appealed to me as covering  
a subject of research unique in our litera-  
ture was Mr. Douglas's "Karl Marx's  
Theories of Surplus Value and Land  
Rent." I cannot conceive of any conven-  
tional Marxist ever discovering in his  
study of "Das Kapital" the facts that Mr.  
Douglas has revealed so significantly. If  
our socialist friends might once get a  
glimpse of the fundamental truth Karl  
Marx evidently saw but did not empha-  
size, their thinking would be clarified and  
their often fine and sincere enthusiasm for  
a better world order be turned into more  
logical and fruitful channels.

The Complete Set of these Conference Papers may be

Obtained for \$1.00 Postpaid

Price—\$2.00 Postpaid

**ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION**

32 East 29th Street, New York City

# London's Overgrowth

**And the Causes of Swollen Towns**

By S. VERE PEARSON, M.A., M.D.  
(Author of "Growth and Distribution of Population")

## CHAPTER HEADINGS

Why London and Other Capital Towns Grow  
London's Past and Present Population  
London's Industries  
Natural Laws Governing the Distribution of Popu-  
lation and Industries  
London's Communications and Transport  
London's Lungs  
London's Housing  
The Pollution of London's Thames  
Exploitation and Sectional Interests  
Sovereign Rights of the People and Their Usurpation  
The Remedy

"Dr. Pearson looks forward to an era in  
which speculation in land will be unprofit-  
able, coercion unnecessary, decentralisation  
will come of its own accord, and such meas-  
ures as rearmament unnecessary in a world  
without envy or the fear of poverty."

—*New Statesman*