

November—December, 1940

Land and Freedom

An International Journal of the Henry George Movement Founded in 1901

The Campaign In Colorado

George J. Knapp

Professor Alonso Alive!

A Prisoner At Tarragona

A Plea For A Revitalized Georgeist Movement In America

Philip Rubin

Season's Greetings

"What is the Kingdom of God? Is it not in the doing of God's will by intelligent beings clothed with free will, intelligent beings knowing good from evil?"—HENRY GEORGE.

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Journal of the Henry George Movement
(Founded by Joseph Dana Miller)

Published Bi-Monthly by
LAND AND FREEDOM, 150 Nassau Street, New York

EDITORS

CHARLES JOS. SMITH JOS. HIRAM NEWMAN
ROBERT CLANCY

Please address all communications and make all remittances payable to Land and Freedom.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—\$2.00 per year. Libraries and Colleges, \$1.00. Special trial offer to students and graduates of the Henry George School of Social Science, \$1.00 for one year. 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.

November—December, 1940

Vol. XL, No. 6

WHOLE No. 223

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: Douglas J. J. Owen.

CANADA: Herbert T. Owens.

BRAZIL: Prof. Fidelino de Figueiredo.

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

SPAIN: Baldomero Argente, Madrid.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

HUNGARY: J. J. Pikler, Budapest.

FRANCE: Jng. Pavlos Giannelia.

INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION	163
THE CAMPAIGN IN COLORADOGeorge J. Knapp	164
PROFESSOR ALONSO ALIVE	166
I REST AWHILELaurie J. Quinby	167
A PLEA FOR A REVITALIZED GEORGEIST MOVEMENT IN AMERICAPhilip Rubin	169
LIECHTENSTEINPavlos Giannelia	172
THE CRITICS CRITICIZEDJacob Schwartzman	173
THE LAND QUESTION IN ROUMANIA AND HUNGARY	175
HONORE DAUMIER	176
GEORGEISM, THOMISM, AND THE CATHOLIC QUESTION	178
THE BATTLE OF THE TOWNSDouglas J. J. Owen	180
A CHALLENGE TO PESSIMISMW. R. B. Willcox	182
SIGNS OF PROGRESS	184
BOOK REVIEWS	187
CORRESPONDENCE	189
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS	191

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, commerce, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries and incomes, and every product of labor and intellect be entirely exempt from taxation.

That there be no restrictions of any kind imposed upon the exchange of goods within or among nations.

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, including commerce and exchange, 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.

"It would require less than the fingers of the two hands to enumerate those who, from Plato down, rank with Henry George among the world's social philosophers . . . No man, no graduate of a higher educational institution, has a right to regard himself as an educated man in social thought unless he has some first-hand acquaintance with the theoretic contribution of this great American thinker."—JOHN DEWEY.

Land and Freedom

VOL. XL

NOVEMBER — DECEMBER, 1940

No. 6

Comment and Reflection

LET us state it clearly. We want to see the defeat of Hitler and Hitlerism. Our lot is cast with democracy, albeit over and over again its processes have disappointed us. We assert that the Georgeist reform is possible of application only in a society where free speech, freedom of assembly and popular government prevail. It is therefore vital that the measure of Freedom we now enjoy be preserved, and defended against encroachment. Nothing can be more dangerous than the smug assumption that Freedom will, somehow, take care of itself. Like all abstractions, Liberty and Justice simply won't work by mere wishful thinking. Rather must they be translated into a behavior of living. There must be realistic effort—risk, if need be—to keep and enjoy the qualities that alone make life worth living.

NEVERTHELESS, let us recognize that Hitler has offered a challenge—one which not to meet is to succumb to Hitlerism, in one form or another. The issue is this:—The old order has changed. The world is interdependent. We can no longer presume to enjoy a comfortable isolation from the misfortunes of other lands. The day of isolation—political as well as economic—is past. The onslaught of the dictators has jarred us into a realization that the boundary lines of the world are not eternal.

TYRANTS, says Henry George, employ current trends for their own purpose, and he adds, "We who would free men should heed the same truth." We already have ample testimony of the manner in which the tyrants are dealing with the current trend of world interdependence. Does not Hitler boast that he will reduce the entire world to the Nazi sway? What plan has democracy athwart this totalitarian threat?

WHAT of internal reconstruction? Hitler has here made another challenge. After the lightning war is to come the lightning peace, swiftly organized. Hitler has a plan, and the weary masses are eager for some way—almost any way—out of the hell of economic insecurity. Against this, what plan can the democracies hold out as an incentive for carrying on the struggle? Typical of the programs proposed for the post-war period is that of Sir Richard Acland, M. P., in his book, *Unser Kampf*, an answer to Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Sir Richard asserts

that a goal worth striving for is the common ownership of the means of production. Yet he senses the danger in this, for he says: "This leaves now only the biggest problem of all, namely that of political and individual liberty under common ownership. The problem is a very real one. Notwithstanding the amount of democratic control over working conditions which will exist through the many different forms of workers' meetings, the whole of the economic work will go forward under one central guiding plan, one organization . . . Over this organization one man will in the last resort preside. Human nature being what it is, we must consider how we can make sure that the political and cultural life of the nation does not fall under the control of this organization or of its chairman." The author goes on to deal with this problem, but in a most unsatisfactory way. He asserts that 100% liberty is impossible, and consoles us with a counter-assertion that 100% denial of liberty is also impossible. An international armed police, incapable of being bribed, is apparently his solution to this "biggest problem of all."

UNFORTUNATELY, this is the sort of idea that is stealing upon the democracies. But is this the thing that democracy is fighting for—an imitation of totalitarianism? Were it not just as well to yield to the enemy? It seems clear to us that any such concentration of power is a broad down-hill road to tyrannical dictatorship. Democracy's answer to Hitler must be something more than, "See, we ourselves are adopting your plan."

ADVOCATES of the collection of the rent of land by government and the abolition of all restrictions on the exchange of goods, have the only workable plan—an economic as well as a political democracy. This is the only *real* answer to Adolf Hitler. On the other hand, we must recognize that the idea of common ownership and centralized power—because of its easy acceptance—is widespread. Yet, this is not to despair. We must learn to do our work in the world as we find it. Social reform cannot be expected to triumph until it becomes instilled in the minds of the people. The same means and opportunities to effect such triumph are at our disposal as are available to all other reform groups. We must not be afraid to face the test of survival of our principles under a democratic order. While from time to time we may be disappointed, we shall refuse to be discouraged. We shall always retain our faith in the Power—and final Victory—of Truth.

The Campaign In Colorado

By GEORGE J. KNAPP

WHEN I ran for Governor of Colorado in 1938, I polled 44,000 votes, although I spent only \$310 in that campaign. This year I spent \$785, and I am credited with only about 10,000 votes in the September primary election.

My failure to land the Democratic nomination for Governor is attributable to two causes:—(1) Election frauds; and (2) a sample ballot published by the *Denver Post* the day before the election and distributed all over the State, which deliberately gave the impression that I was forced out of the race by some legal disqualification. Thus, tens of thousands of voters were fooled into thinking they would be wasting their votes if they voted for me.

Both these causes hinge on one major cause:—My whole campaign was based on single-tax plans, and the political machine and the *Denver Post* were fully aware of the whole situation. They had every reason to fight me.

As for the first item—election frauds—the recent primary was the most corrupt this State has had in many years. This was shown by a court recount in the case of a contest over the Democratic nomination for District Attorney in Denver. In the course of this contest, 23 ballot boxes were opened in court, and it was found that as many as 40 votes were stolen from one candidate and counted for another in a single voting precinct. Two election officials have been made the subject of criminal complaints in connection with these frauds.

As for myself, I have not sufficient money to contest my own votes in court; but in the case that *was* contested the recount showed the losing candidate to be the winner.

The extent of the frauds may be judged from these facts:—Two years ago, when I almost succeeded in obtaining the Democratic nomination, I carried election districts X and Y by large majorities. This time I am supposed to have received but two or three votes in each of the 73 precincts, plus districts D and T. In addition, two years ago, I carried Arapahoe County handsomely. Arapahoe County adjoins Denver on the South. Upwards of 1000 voters had signed my petitions in Arapahoe County. They are all personal friends of mine, and enthusiastic for the things I stand for. Yet, on the face of the returns, I am credited with only 350 votes in that County.

Two years ago, after I had almost defeated Teller Ammons, then Governor, for the nomination, some of the "machine" crowd told me, "We will be ready for you next



time, if you run again." Well, they *were ready* for me this time, as they have full control of the election machinery.

Corrupt as were these election frauds, the thing that did me the most harm was the *Denver Post* sample ballot, which was intended to give the impression—and succeeded in doing so—that I was out of the race; the impression that for some unstated legal reason I had been disqualified at the last moment. A section of the *Post's* sample primary ballot (published Monday, September 9, the day before the election) is reproduced herewith.

The specific point that gave the impression that I was disqualified was the use of the words "Not Qualified" after my name on the sample ballot.

In addition, the following headline and preface appeared above the sample ballot (*italics are mine*):

BE SURE TO VOTE TUESDAY—HERE ARE MARKED BALLOTS TO HELP YOU

These marked ballots are published for the convenience of the voters in Tuesday's primary election. Cut out the ballot of your party and take it to the polls with you. It will help you in *eliminating the worst* and in selecting the best candidates. In publishing these marked ballots, the DENVER POST is not trying to tell anybody how to vote. It is merely passing on to the voters *the results of its investigation of the merits of the various candidates*. Few voters know personally all the candidates. Few have an opportunity to check up for themselves on all the candidates. As a public service, the Post has investigated carefully the candidates on both Democratic and Republican tickets. For the convenience of the voting public, the Post's conclusions are presented in the form of these marked ballots.

The Colorado State Constitution prescribes the qualifications for a candidate for Governor. I am fully qualified, according to these provisions, to occupy the office of Governor of Colorado. I am a native born citizen of the United States, am fifty-five years of age, and have lived in the State of Colorado a total of sixteen years, nine of which were immediately preceding the election.

Yet the *Post* singled me out as the one man among all the dozens of candidates for various offices on that sample ballot as being "not qualified." That fact, taken in connection with the use of the word "worst" in the heading of

the article, held me out to the world as being utterly degraded and contemptible, and as worthy of naught but scorn and ridicule. The *Post* was guilty of a false and malicious statement of fact. When they used the words "Not Qualified," without explanation of what impression they intended to convey, they perpetrated what is known in law as a *libel per se*.

The *Denver Post* has for forty years been the most notorious sheet in Colorado, and yet it has the largest circulation of any paper in the State. The paper was at one time described by the late Rev. F. O'Ryan as "a newspaper with the instincts of a hyena, the manners of a barroom, and the morals of Market Street." (At that time Market Street was the Denver red-light district.)

I was en route to Pueblo when this sample ballot was published, and knew nothing of it until I arrived at Pueblo about 9 P. M., the night before the election. It was then too late to do anything, even by radio, to counteract the mischief.

The effects of this trick can be imagined from the fact that, after the *Post* appeared with the sample ballot in it, my headquarters in Denver and Pueblo were besieged with telephone calls for hours from voters wanting to know "why Knapp has been disqualified." Tens of thousands of votes were probably lost because of this fraud.

However, aside from a libel suit against the *Post*—which I intend to undertake—there is nothing to be done about it. The *Post's* trick has affected my reputation to such an extent that it is imperative that I file an action. The prestige gained two years ago, when I lacked only a few votes of beating the "machine" in a single-handed campaign, was a valuable asset stolen from me on the eve of the last election.

Past Supreme Court decisions indicate that I have an A-1 basis for a libel action. After weeks of research, I have found a case that is admirably suited for the point I wish to make—that the *Post* publication was a libel per se. It is the case of *MacInnis v. The National Herald*, 140 Minn. 171; 167 NW 1, where the Supreme Court of Minnesota held: "A false written charge that a candidate . . . is not a citizen, when citizenship is a requisite of eligibility, is

libelous per se." The Court stated in its decision (italics mine): "No case holding this precise point is cited, but there is no need of one. The article assailed the legal right of the plaintiff to be a candidate." The Court further held that no matter how vague or ambiguous the charge might be, it is a libel per se.

But the campaign is over now, and "what's done cannot be undone." We must look forward to the future. It is of the utmost importance and I am greatly concerned about it. We must either achieve single-tax legislation in Colorado in 1942, or forget all about it, and count it as a lost cause, as far as this State is concerned.

Here is the reason for that:—Last summer, the ex-service men started to circulate a petition for an amendment to exempt property owned by ex-service men from taxation to the extent of \$2000 each. The exemption they proposed applied to land as well as improvements. I succeeded in dissuading them. Their proposed amendment was dropped. I told them that I would, in 1942, try to initiate a real amendment for tax exemp-

tions which would give them what they want, and also give the same exemptions to the people of the State generally. As stated, the ex-service men dropped their proposed amendment, and it was not on the ballot this Fall.

However, unless I submit an amendment in 1942, there is no doubt that these ex-service men will revive their amendment and have it on the ballot in 1942. If so, the exemptions they will provide for will be as stated, on land as well as improvements. You

can see what effect that will have on any later attempt by us to submit an amendment along our lines.

I am anxious during the next two years to organize the home-owners in all the larger cities of the State for an amendment to exempt *improvements*. I also want to organize the merchants for an exemption on stocks of merchandise.

The campaigns of 1938 and 1940 have left me very low in funds. I hope I will receive enough support from those who are interested in this plan to put it across. I want to impress all our friends with the fact stated above—that unless we submit an amendment in 1942, we may as well forget about the single-tax in Colorado for a long time.

Sample Direct Primary Election Ballot
DEMOCRATIC PARTY

To vote for a person mark a cross (X) in the first square at the right of the name of the person for whom you desire to vote.
To vote for another person whose name is not printed on the ballot, write name of such person in the blank space immediately following the printed names of candidates for such office. In no case shall name be written of candidates appearing on any other party ballot.

<p>FOR REPRESENTATIVE IN LXXVII CONGRESS 1ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT (Vote for One)</p> <p>LAWRENCE LEWIS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>FOR STATE SENATOR 1ST SENATORIAL DISTRICT (Vote for Four)</p> <p>A. B. HIRSHFIELD <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>R. B. LATHIER <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>JOSEPH F. CONSTANTINE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>SIEGHER B. WALK <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>STUDSOKA BELL-SMITH <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>VAL HIGGINS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>CHARLES D. STRONG <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>FOR DISTRICT JUDGE 2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (to fill vacancy) (Vote for One)</p> <p>FLOYD F. MILLS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>FOR JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT (Vote for One)</p> <p>BENJAMIN C. HILLIARD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>FOR REPRESENTATIVE IN THE 3RD GENERAL ASSEMBLY, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER (Vote for Fifteen)</p> <p>DONNIC A. COLGROSSO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>IRVING GREEN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>MICHAEL D. McDONALD <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>CLEM CROWLEY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>GEORGE J. BAKA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>WILLIAM <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY, 2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT (Vote for One)</p> <p>ALFRED J. CUMBERB <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>G. OTTO MOORE <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>OSR D. BOWMAN <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>FOR GOVERNOR (Vote for One)</p> <p>GEORGE E. RAUNDERS BOTH QUALIFIED</p> <p>JOHN A. CARROLL QUALIFIED</p> <p>GEORGE J. KNAPP NOT QUALIFIED</p>	<p>FOR COUNTY JUDGE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER (Vote for One)</p> <p>CHARLES EDGAR BERTERLING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>FOR JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT, CITY, AND COUNTY OF DENVER (Vote for One)</p> <p>PHILIP B. GILLIAM <input type="checkbox"/></p>

FROM THE DENVER POST MONDAY, SEPT. 9, 1940

Professor Alonso Alive!

A Prisoner At Tarragona

OUR dear colleague, Prof. Antonio F. Matheu Alonso, a leader of the Georgeist Cause in Spain, had been given up as dead by Georgeists on both sides of the Atlantic. How elated we were, therefore, to receive a letter from him recently, from Tarragona, in which he explained the reason for his long silence!

* * *

Prof. Matheu Alonso was an instructor of economics and French at the University of Salamanca in Spain. In both subjects he used Henry George's works as text-books. In his courses in French, he used a French translation of "Progress and Poverty" for the students to translate into Spanish.

In 1934, the Professor paid a brief visit to the United States in order to study the American Georgeist movement. A warm friendship was formed between him and Joseph Dana Miller. "He radiates friendship and sincerity," Mr. Miller wrote of the man. Prof. Alonso was profoundly impressed by the Henry George School of Social Science, which had been founded only two years before by Oscar Geiger. He resolved to create a similar institution in his native country. When he returned to Spain, he wrote to Mr. Miller: "I am trying to found a Henry George School here like that of the late Oscar Geiger. The director will be Mr. Argente." (Baldomero Argente is President of the Liga Georgista Espanola.)

Prof. Alonso accepted the position of Spanish correspondent of LAND AND FREEDOM, and we received regular communications from him. In 1936, however, when the Spanish Civil War broke out, his communications became less frequent. The last word we received from him was in January 1939. He explained that his country was in a very bad economic condition, and that it was difficult to trade or communicate with the outside world. However, he expressed hope in the future of the Georgeist Cause. Shortly afterwards, the Fascists won the struggle and gained political control of Spain. And then no more communications from Prof. Alonso. Our letters and magazines were returned by the Military Censor.

In June 1940, resigned to the fact that we could not reach personally Prof. Alonso, we wrote to Sr. Baldomero Argente in Madrid for information. Readers will recall Sr. Argente's letter in our July-August 1940 number. He reported he, too, had no news of Prof. Alonso and had given him up as lost. Sr. Argente accepted our proposal to take the position of Spanish correspondent in place of Prof. Alonso.

And then—a few days ago—we received an unexpected letter from Prof. Alonso himself! We present it herewith, translated through the courtesy of Mr. E. Vadillo Ruiz:

"My Dear Georgeist Friends:

"I am writing in Spanish to facilitate the work of the Censors. Don Baldomero Argente has informed me of all your worries about myself, for which I thank you very sincerely.

"Since September 1936—that is, within the Period of the Revolution—I was here at Tarragona, working as professor at the Instituto y Escuela Normal del Magisterio, and also working at my profession of Law. I used Henry George's books in my classes, both for comment and translation.

"When General Franco's troops entered Tarragona, accusations and indictments of the citizens who remained here began. Many had fled to France, and so escaped.

"I was the victim of the jealousy of a lawyer, who charged me with accusing my Fascist clients instead of defending them. This charge was so false that I was able to clear myself by presenting a certificate which vindicated me completely. This certificate refers to the first five death sentences which were demanded before the Special Court of the Guard of Tarragona by the previous Loyalist Government, and which I opposed. Two of the cases I saved in Tarragona, and the other three I was also able to save at the Court in Barcelona. After these cases had been decided, no further death penalties were imposed, due to the fact that the Special Court used the decisions on these first cases whenever the death penalty was demanded. Thus no one else was sentenced to death.

"Though I was completely cleared of the charge against myself, nevertheless there were other charges. The Fascists discovered that I had been an outstanding republican, and that a political party had nominated me as candidate for Deputy in 1936. They found that in my teachings I propagated the Georgeist doctrine, which the judge of the Court qualified as 'anarchistic and anti-patriotic.'

"In my defense, I showed them that the Georgeist doctrine is not anarchistic, and that our doctrine is approved by the Holy See; and I related the story of Dr. Edward McGlynn, Pastor of St. Stephen's in New York. I also pointed out that General Fanjul, collaborator of General Franco, had been Vice President of the Liga Georgista Espanola, and that our Secretary, Don Arturo Soria, was assassinated by the Communists.

"The Tribunal was very much impressed by the case of Dr. McGlynn, but it took them forty-five days to ascertain whether or not Georgeism was a revolutionary doctrine. Since I held no high political position, and since I have never been involved in a crime, I was not sentenced to death, but was given a life sentence. During the forty-five days, however, I was in prison among those sentenced to death. Each night I saw my companions taken out to die, and one night I thought they were going to take me, too. You see, I was on the brink of being the first Georgeist martyr!

"After my sentence was confirmed, I was transferred to the Prison of San Miguel de los Reyes in Valencia, where I remained completely *incomunicado* until August 26, when I was liberated. Due to a reviewing of sentences, mine has been reduced to six years.

"My present status is that of prisoner in my own home, and of course I will not be reinstated in the University to continue my teachings. My immediate problem is to be able to live, since the authorities have confiscated my home and everything I possessed, including my clothing, and even my professional diplomas. I am living now through the kindness of my sister. I hope that the authorities will at least allow me to work as an attorney. If not, I will be compelled to request help from you to approach the Spanish Embassy in Washington to give me a passport to the United States, so that I might establish myself in your country as Professor of Spanish and Economic Philosophy. For two years I was lecturer in Spanish at the University of Liverpool, England.

"Since the middle of 1938, I have not received any word from you, and I have been out of touch with the movement in America. I trust that the Henry George School is still growing. We have to recognize that Oscar Geiger had a great idea, and thanks to him, our Cause has entered a new period of efficacy. If we had continued with the old methods, we could never have reached our ends.

"We have to accept the fact that Henry George's words are the most efficient means for converting people. To us, his pupils, it remains only to propagate his works and succeed in making the people read his books directly. To this end, the best means is to offer students the opportunity to study collectively the works of Henry George; and this is the method of the School, the great vision of Oscar Geiger.

"I wish to renew my acquaintance with all my Georgeist friends in America, and request that you supply me with Georgeist literature. Cordial regards to all the Georgeists, and affectionate greetings to you, my dear friends."

* * *

(We have already communicated with Washington, and hope to assist Prof. Alonso to come to this country, should the occasion warrant. We will keep our readers informed of developments.—Ed.)

I Rest Awhile

But I Shall Awake To Strive Again

FROM Mrs. Bessie Beach Truelhart we have received an obituary of Laurie J. Quinby, who died November 17th at the age of 71. Mr. Quinby was elected to the Nebraska State Senate in 1915. With other work there he accomplished the consolidation of Omaha and suburbs. He was one of the active promoters of the new State Capitol and the New Constitution for the State providing for Unicameral Legislation. He was the author of several books and pamphlets, among them, "Three Paths," "The American Republic of States and Democracy of Citizens," and "The Natural Basis of Morals and Ethics."

Mr. Quinby's funeral was unique in that he had written his own obituary, with the request that it be read at his funeral. We present it herewith.—Ed.

* * *

GENTLE FRIENDS, HAIL AND FAREWELL.

For me, this act of the play is ended. In Life's Drama I played but a minor part. Into this part I put the best that was in me. Not always did I confine myself to the written lines, but wherever I felt that revision of them might be made by me, I did not hesitate so to revise them. Whether such was for good and betterment of all, Time alone will tell. Yet, looking back, I feel that much more I might have done. Many actors in this Drama I have loved. To them I am indebted for the contributions they made to my faith in mankind. However dark each day's shadows were, I found that at heart mankind is divine.

The everlasting play shall go on. Its players, day after day, shall step aside, only that greater artists may appear upon the stage to play their parts. That, through some divine law, I was given a part in this Drama is to me of infinite satisfaction. "I thank whatever gods may be" for Life's glorious experiences.

In the Drama of Life, from childhood to this day, I was in and felt the tragedies of its many scenes, but into my heart came joy and gratitude for the struggle. Though, at times, I felt quite alone, yet I was not alone. Back of me was a parentage that did not cramp my forming years. Into my life came friends devoted and true. For the affection and love of splendid women and the strong support and assistance of noble men, I render to Life the gratitude of a devoted heart.

I experienced want and poverty. I knew the weight of Privilege, for I strove beneath its feet. In the darkest days of it all, I mustered all the elements of my patience—even to the point of reducing that "patience" to mustard, whose pungent tang at times quite o'erwhelmed me. Yet, upon reflection, knowing my own weaknesses, this knowledge impelled me to overlook the foibles of others. Though, occasionally, I did not hesitate to criticize, deep within me there was no feeling of resentment. I did not wish to make of myself a section of "the day of judgment." I caught glimmerings of Natural Law under which, through his inadequate knowledge, man had struggled and fallen, but rose again to fight and to carry on. Yes, to carry on forever in unity and harmony with and under the Natural Law of Justice. Truly, the trend of the universe is good.

For the inspiring beauty of his poetic concepts and expressions of Life, more than speech may ever tell, I am beholden to the master, Shakespeare. "What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving, how express and ad-

mirable! in action, how like an angel! in apprehension, how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!"

For what visions of Infinite Love I caught, I shall forever pay my homage to the Prophets of all religions, at the head of whom I place the gentle Gautama and the tender-hearted Nazarene. To Emerson and to Henry George I pay my heart-felt tribute for the concepts of Natural Law that must forever guide us. The Sage of Concord instructed me in the knowledge that "We are begirt by laws which execute themselves," and he addressed to all men the question, "If one could, in the least particular, alter the course of Nature, who would accept the gift of Life?"

The Prophet and the Seer of civilized society and social progress, Henry George, gave me insight into the truth that all the sufferings of men are due to man's violation of Natural Law, obedience to which he proved would advance personal and social peace among the brotherhood of men. He admonished me and all men to —

"Look around today.

"Lo, here and now, in our civilized society, the old allegories yet have a meaning, the old myths are still true. Into the valley of the Shadow of Death yet often leads the path of duty, through the streets of Vanity Fair walk Christian and Faithful, and on Great-heart's armor ring the clanging blows. Ormuzd still fights with Ahriman—the Prince of Light with the Powers of Darkness. He who will hear, to him the clarions of the battle call.

"How they call, and call, and call, till the heart swells that hears them! Strong soul and high endeavor, the world needs them now. Beauty still lies imprisoned, and iron wheels go over the good and true and beautiful that might spring from human lives.

"And they who fight with Ormuzd, though they may not know each other, somewhere, sometime, will the muster roll be called."

Yes, Strong Soul, I was mustered into that host that caught the gleams of Natural Justice. That host whose eyes saw the dawning of a better day, where want and misery among mankind should be no more. That host whose mind grasped the truth that before the Primal Pioneer placed him upon this planet He made full provision for man, that from Whose Storehouse—the land—man might secure every element for his nourishment and good, without let or hindrance. That host whose understanding saw that Privilege had entered in and through unjust enactments by governments, had preempted Nature's bounties and levied tribute upon men who sought the blessings their Father had provided for them. Now, to these hosts—

All hail, strong champions of a noble cause!
Defenders of Eternal Justice, hail!
True heralds of the time when, from the heights
Of mankind's rich attainment of the goal
(Whereto the seers of every age have urged)
Majestic Liberty shall loud proclaim
The winners of her Diadems of Peace—
Above the ranks of kings and potentates,
Shall stand Apostles of our Henry George.
When scoffers jeered and Truth was in eclipse,
He stood for common Justice and the right
Of every man to freedom of the land.

To hold aloft the emblem of this cause,
Where eye of man may everywhere behold,
In acts heroic when the lords of earth
Would from this storehouse of our world withhold
The hand of Toil and brain of Enterprise.
For such they do when these they blight and check
With taxes levied on the needs of man.

When all have plenty, then the bitter strife
(Dark foe to onward, upward march of man)
Shall end, and in its place the Song of Peace
(To which the lyres of Ancient Bards were strung)
Shall sound along the highways of the world.
For plenty is the fruit of Toil alone,
Applied to Nature's bounties which our God
For all mankind, has lovingly ordained.

'Tis not God's will that pomp and glory shine
Through shutting from His land the race of men.
And, by His Law, eternal and supreme,
Who close the land against the right of Toil,
Shall, by that act, deprive themselves of good;
For naught that is unjust shall here remain,
While God is Love and Justice is His Law.

For the vision of a glorified humanity, under the glow of Liberty and Justice through obedience to Natural Law, I owe a debt of gratitude to the immortal Henry George. When in early life, first I caught that vision, I resolved that gratitude for it demanded of me the gift of my heart's devotion. I kept that pledge. I fought the fight. Yet still the vision gleams before me and lures me on to greater effort. Toward it, still may I strive on in larger spheres of influence, until upon this earth no child shall go to bed ahungered; not one mother fear for the safety of her brood; nor one father among men strive against his brother for Liberty and Justice and the Peace of the World. You, all of us shall move forward until these blessings shall flow into the lives of men, filling and surrounding them with the happiness of Life, as the golden orb of day illumines our universe with light.

Fervently I rest serene in the thought that, as I bid the world farewell, leaving my beloved ones to the kindness of mankind, shall be greeted by those to whom I gave my heart's devotion there upon the other Shore of Life. Toward that shore, upon a widening channel, I float into and over the Infinite Sea.

Laurie J. Quinby

Postscript—

Since nothing in its complete essence ever is begun, neither is anything ever finished. (Not even this posthumous letter, as will be noted.) Whatever is, had a heretofore and shall have a hereafter. It is inconceivable that anything can spring from nothing. It is equally inconceivable that annihilation can result for anything that now exists. If this be true of the atom, can it be less true of the mind—or whatever that may be which we denominate the soul. Then, as every atom is essential to the universe, not one soul can be spared from the Unity of life. The same Thought which, before time, called me into individual mortal life, shall call me back again when It shall have need of me here. Just for a while—

Farewell.

Laurie J. Quinby

THE liberty of the press, trial by jury, the Habeas Corpus Writ, even Magna Charta itself, although justly deemed the palladia of freedom, are all inferior considerations, when compared with the general distribution of real property among every class of people. Let the people have property and they will have power—a power that will forever be exerted to prevent the restriction of the press, and abolition of trial by jury, or the abridgment of any other privilege.

—NOAH WEBSTER

A Plea For A Revitalized Georgeist Movement In America

By PHILIP RUBIN

IN Australia and New Zealand, a municipal single tax exists in many cities; Denmark imposes a national tax on land values; in Great Britain there is a parliamentary land-value taxation bloc of fifty members, influential and powerful enough to pass a national land-value taxation bill the moment a Labor government comes into being when this war is over.

But what progress has been made in the United States of America, birth-place and home of Henry George? Only the irrigation districts of central California and a handful of tiny "single-tax" colonies. There is not a single city here—not even a small city—which exempts improvements entirely from taxation. Georgeists have no considerable strength in a single state legislature, no influence upon Congress or the national administration. This, after more than half a century of earnest, devoted, self-sacrificing agitation.

What is to blame? What is the trouble? After nearly a decade of study of the Georgeist movement in this country, I have come to the conclusion that the blame lies partly with American Georgeists themselves. In order not to be misunderstood, let me emphasize the word "partly". It is true that to a large extent the lack of progress of American Georgeism in practical politics and practical accomplishment is due to objective conditions in America which Georgeists alone can hardly change—a materialistic and "ruggedly-individualistic" psychology which has not been interested in a social order based on justice, but only in satisfying its own immediate selfish needs; a speculator and gambler psychology which has given rise to the most corrupt political life of any country in the world.

The fault of American Georgeists is that, in revolting against the corrupt American political life of the half-century and more before 1933, they have allowed themselves to swing to the other extreme—that of idealism, which, lacking contact with ordinary, every-day human problems and human beings, tends to become fanatical dogma, the cult of a priestly elite, educated to mouth certain phrases without being expected to attempt to put these ideas into practice. Thus, what was once a vigorous reform movement, becomes the property of intellectual snobs who look down with contempt upon stupid hoi-polloi. American Georgeism today is too respectful of the aristocratic individualism expressed by such as Mr. Albert Jay Nock, among whose disciples, unfortunately, is to be found Mr. Frank Chodorov, Director of the Henry George School of Social Science.

Because American Georgeists have allowed themselves to be pushed out of American practical politics—a thing they should not have allowed to happen—it is possible for us to be told (as Mr. Chodorov did tell us in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM) that politics and organization are not for such angelic beings as Georgeists, that education alone—education of more Olympians who will be willing to sit with us on our lofty mountains and help us while our time away in vain quibblings over obscure doctrinal points—is all that is necessary. One may laugh at this point of view if one doesn't take the Georgeist movement too seriously, if one hasn't made it a part of his or her life. But Henry George at least, who died while in the midst of a campaign for the mayoralty of New York, who knew and felt that political action and education could only be separated from each other at grave peril to the movement, wouldn't have laughed, for he would have realized its serious implications for the further progress of the fight to return the soil to the people.

So today, nearly eight years after the advent of New Deal Liberalism, which might have given us the chance for many practical accomplishments in the field of land value taxation in this country had we gone about it in the right way, we still remain immaculate idealists and dogmatists, untouched and unharmed by worldly politicians, proud—oh, how proud!—of our virginity. How long will this spinster attitude of American Georgeism prevail? I have no way of telling. But I do know it's about time to shake off our apathy. There is too much work to be done in these United States for us to sit idly by, prating about education versus organization. People are eager to hear our message, *providing* we will relate it to their daily needs—*providing* we will display more humanity towards the remote ideal of the confiscation of land rent and the abolition of all taxes. For example, there is an immediate need to exempt buildings (I don't like the word "improvements" — it's too technical and the man in the street doesn't "get" it), and put a much higher tax on vacant and semi-vacant lots than is now the case in our cities, so that cheap, but decent, homes may be erected for millions of American slum dwellers.

The Federal government, now embarked on its huge defense program, is worried about finding proper housing in the future for millions of workers. Can't we Georgeists show the Federal, as well as local, governments that our way—a high tax on vacant lots and concurrent exemption of buildings—is the only way to prevent land owners from

holding up large-scale housing for defense workers, that such a method of taxation is therefore the patriotic method? Are we willing to do this, or would we prefer to continue our unconstructive attacks upon the Administration for its failure to become one hundred per cent Georgeist?

If Georgeism in the United States is to begin to show practical achievements in the direction of the ideal of justice and freedom as Henry George formulated it, I am convinced Georgeists will have to reconstruct their views on human nature, human aspirations and the possibilities for persuading people by utilizing the faculties that lie within the human make-up. They will have to learn to maintain a balance between idealism and life's realities: they will have to learn to become politicians, if not in the derogatory American, then in the more complimentary British sense. If Georgeists fail to impress themselves upon the psychology of average Americans, believing with the Marxians that only economic interests dictate people's thinking, they will remain just where they are today.

Certain steps which American Georgeism ought to take immediately, to get back into the main stream of American daily life, here suggest themselves. Some of them have already been mentioned by Mr. Mortimer A. Leister in the last issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*. I shall try to give a bare summary of them in what follows:

1. *Organization.* An American Association for Land Value Taxation, similar in aim and scope to the British association, should be formed, and divided into state associations. These groups should never forget that while land value taxation and the pure Georgeist ideal are related to each other as an immediate means is related to a remoter end, they are not identical, and that though a great number of people will go along with us part of the way, only a few will be willing to follow us all the way. All, therefore, that it can and should advocate is *greater* land value taxation concurrently with the exemption from taxation of certain things, such as buildings, necessary consumers' articles, etc.

The headquarters of the national organization should be either in Washington, Pittsburgh or Chicago, *not* in New York City, whose life and mode of thinking is not characteristic of that of the rest of the country, and which is too much the paradise of esoteric quibblers. Either of the three cities I have mentioned has its advantages as national headquarters—Washington, because it is the seat of government; Pittsburgh, because we have accomplished a little and have an opportunity to still further demonstrate, practically, our principles in that city; Chicago, because of its central location. Which of these three is best suited as a national headquarters, would accomplish most for Georgeism if an American Association for Land Value Taxation were located there I am not quite certain, though I would perhaps vote for Washington. But I am convinced that New York is unsuited for this purpose.

2. *Our relation to Socialism.* Georgeism has, with justice I think, been called moderate socialism, practical socialism, sane socialism. We *do* advocate the socialization of rent and of necessary monopolies, and some are also in favor of the socialization of finance and credit. True, our theoretical differences with the Marxian Socialists and Communists are wide and profound, opposing as we do the socialization of productive capital and the destruction by the State of competitive, private-profit industry. But today the more moderate Socialists, or Social-Democrats, realizing what the destruction of competitive, private-profit industry has done to Russia, are inclined to be less enthusiastic about this phase of their program and to put more emphasis on the idea of socializing monopolies—that is, non-competitive industry—which Georgeists also advocate. Why shouldn't Georgeists enter the moderately-socialistic Labor Party of New York and similar parties in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Washington State, etc., there to advocate their views and through these parties advance their cause practically, as has been done in Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain? Either we should do this or be prepared to form a political party of our own, as our Danish friends have done, a thing I personally would not advocate for this country.

I presume that individual Georgeists who work in certain trades are as active trade unionists as are workers of other convictions. But it would, I believe, help the Georgeist cause in this country if Georgeists as a group kept up an active interest in American labor unions and their problems, particularly the problem of keeping them free from corrupt leaders.

I know several active Georgeists who also take an active interest in the consumer cooperative movement and are even among the leaders. Here Georgeist groups might participate more directly than in labor unions, might become influential and serve the cause by more group participation in the movement for cooperative stores, still a young and growing movement in this country. In their necessity to combine idealism with a realistic view of things, the cooperative and Georgeist movements have much in common.

In the smaller cities and towns of this country, I find that the more liberal churches are among the best groups in which Georgeists might work. In my own town—a small New England city of some 30,000 people—I find the Social Justice League of the Unitarian Church the most receptive group in the community. Other Georgeists in small cities of similar size have probably found a similar situation.

In states like my own, where the Democratic party represents progressivism and readiness to listen to new ideas we can and should work with and through that party. In such cases—but in such only—it might be good policy on our part to emphasize our differences with the Socialists rather than our similarities.

3. *Working on local government.* Getting people to sign petitions to city councils for building exemption would, I believe, be an excellent way of educating masses of people who never heard of Henry George to the importance of land value taxation for their own immediate welfare. Such petitions would compel newspapers to give us a good deal more publicity than they ordinarily would, besides bringing the question vividly home to large numbers of peoples and causing a healthy discussion. However, I would advocate this procedure only for smaller cities and towns, not for places of more than 100,000 population.

4. *Correct philosophy of life.* Henry George wanted society to be based on both justice and freedom, but of the two he realized that justice was the more important, because more fundamental. We deprive a criminal of his freedom, because we believe it just that society should do so, because one man's freedom may endanger the freedom of thousands. We believe then that freedom *in society* is conditioned by the principle of social equity, is dependent on justice, and not vice versa, and that when justice prevails freedom will automatically follow, but that when freedom is granted the individual, justice among men does not automatically result. We believe in social justice *and* in the individual freedom which it alone can establish and guarantee.

But many American Georgeists talk today as if individual liberty, not social justice, were fundamental. And so, average Americans, listening to us, ask, "What is the difference between your beliefs and Mr. Hoover's rugged individualism?" Of course there is a vast difference, but by emphasizing individualism at the expense of Collectivism or Socialism (a point I thought Henry George made clear when he showed the necessity of each *in its proper place*), we invite misunderstanding of our position by otherwise progressive-minded people, a misunderstanding for which only we ourselves are to blame.

5. *More warmth of friendship among American Georgeists.* This is a delicate subject, which at first glance might not seem so important for the practical progress of the movement in America, but if we are to accomplish anything here, we must be united by deeper and warmer bonds of friendship than we have hitherto shown toward one another. Socialists and Communists address their fellow workers as "Comrade," and what is even more significant, I believe, is the fact that when Socialists or Communists meet, their conversation shows that the range of interests which they have in common is far wider than the interests shared by Georgeists.

American Georgeists, unlike British Georgeists I met in London, are too apt to regard one another only as economic thinking machines, sharing no other common interests, such as sports, sex, art, music or literature. In our conversations we give each other the impression of monomaniacs, which

we really are not. We are, at bottom, as warmly human, as alive and as imaginative—perhaps even more so—as people of other radical beliefs. Let us then relate our philosophy to the richness and fullness of human life, instead of narrowing our common interest to a condemnation of the present economic system.

To return to the point where I started in this article, I would say that our excessive idealism has led to both fanatical zeal and dogmatic coldbloodedness. America today is undergoing a psychologic change from its excessive materialism and rugged individualism. Because of this change American Georgicism must change its attitude. At long last, we have an opportunity to meet and mingle with the American mind and heart. But we must be willing not only to teach, but to be taught as well, if we are to accomplish anything worthwhile in this country in the direction of Henry George's ideal of social justice.

Let us stop talking nonsense about developing an intellectual elite. Let us forsake our ivory towers and relate our ideal to the throbbing life that surrounds us. Let us learn that only friendships and brotherhood among human beings can usher in an era of social justice and individual freedom. When we have done that, the satisfaction and joy of accomplishment, of achievement, will be ours.

ONE in a series of documentary short films released by M.G.M., known as "The Passing Parade," deals with a very interesting account of the fight against the disease pellagra. This film, entitled "A Way In The Wilderness," is the story of the discoveries of Dr. Joseph Goldberger in his investigations of the disease. Contrary to general belief, Dr. Goldberger proved that pellagra is not caused by a germ, but is the result of malnutrition. When his theories were substantiated, the Government proceeded to send the proper food supplies to the stricken areas. But then came the depression—general low wages—the migrant workers, the Okies . . . and more pellagra. It became evident that the root of the disease is now beyond medical science. The cause is poverty. Science, says the commentator in this film, has done all it can—it has contributed its share. The rest—the solution to the problem of poverty—is in the hands of 130 million citizens.

A SAD commentary on the effects of our city civilization upon the health of the citizens is the fact that over 20% of the men called in the first New York City draft failed to pass the Army medical examination. Raised in an artificial and repressive environment, and divorced from healthy contact with the good earth, this is not too surprising. The officials who are now worrying over the high percentage of unfit men would do well to ponder the inequitable holding of the land they are preparing to defend.

Liechtenstein—"Land Without Army Or Taxes"

By PAVLOS GIANNELIA

IT is not certain that the little state of Liechtenstein will always exist, although it has maintained its sovereignty since 1719. Indeed, I am not sure what will be its fate by the time these lines are published.

This tiny principality has an area of 60 square miles and a population of 12,000. It lies on the right of the river Rhine, below Lake Constance, between Austria and Switzerland. Liechtenstein is famed as "the land without army and without taxes." The first averment is true, but not the second. In 1937 the State collected 1,500,000 Swiss francs in taxes, and its eleven Communes totalled a collection of 700,000. But notwithstanding, the legislation of Liechtenstein has singular points of interest to Georgians.

"The dorsal spine of the direct taxes is the property tax and the income tax," states the special report of Liechtenstein on the Land Tax, and further explains: "Real property, being immovable, is easily assessed, and much more difficult to escape taxation than income." But receipts from the direct taxes were only 150,000 Swiss francs. The indirect taxes, which the people pay unconsciously—believing (as do the people of other countries) that the little rates, fees and stamps have no importance—exceeded many times the revenue from direct taxes; they amounted to 1,100,000 Swiss francs.

What is interesting in Liechtenstein's land tax is the method of calculating the tax rate. This rate is $1\frac{1}{2}$ per mill of the property, and 2 per cent of the income. Every year, the Parliament decides whether the whole tax rate must be collected, or a part of it, or a multiple of it. In recent years, the prosperity of the country has caused Parliament to decide to collect only half the tax rate, that is, $\frac{3}{4}$ per mill of the property and one per cent of the income.

Georgeists can appreciate this method of calculation insofar as it taxes land owners more heavily and exempts the landless who are occupied in agriculture. Georgeists, however, would prefer to see the property tax reduced to land and water power only, without any taxation of improvements or manufactured products, and without any income tax.

As regards Liechtenstein's corporation tax, it must be understood that this country is an Eldorado of holding companies. The number of such companies is not published; but there are many. (If it is true that there are



12,000 holding companies, there would be one for every inhabitant!) The receipts from taxes on these companies was, in 1937, 305,200 Sw. fr. (The State collected 202,600 and the Communes 102,600.) This tax does not burden the home population but only foreign companies which come to Liechtenstein to sanction

their holding titles. These companies appreciate the very liberal, and not at all punitive, tax legislation of this microscopic yet sovereign State.

Another interesting feature of the legislation is the customs-union with Switzerland. This latter country has assumed the customs service for Liechtenstein, and pays its government annually the round sum of 450,000 Sw. fr. The annual customs receipts are about 325,000,000 Sw. fr., or 80 Sw. fr. for each inhabitant of both Switzerland and Liechtenstein. The share of the latter country, then, should be nearly one million francs; but the reason it only receives half this amount is that Switzerland also assumes other expenses for Liechtenstein, such as diplomatic and consular services.

Many calculations have proven that the customs duties impose a burden on the economy of Liechtenstein that amounts to *three times* the revenue collected by the government. Thus each inhabitant of Switzerland and Liechtenstein is obliged to pay 240 Sw. fr. in the process of paying customs duties instead of only 80, which is all the government collects. This sum is more than the state and local taxes take from them—which amounts to about 180 or 200 francs. This burden compels the people of Liechtenstein to pay more for all the goods that are imported, such as fuel, automobiles, sugar, metals, and many other products which cannot be domestically produced.

The receipts from this fining of the people go largely to "protect" the chief industries of Liechtenstein—wine and textiles. By the free importation of the goods mentioned above, Liechtenstein would have more to gain than by this imaginary protection of wine and textiles. Certainly the unemployed could more easily get work by free trade than by the present system of subsidizing.

Unfortunately, as can be seen, this little State is far from Georgian principles. The chief local gazette has urged the citizens not to spend in foreign countries the money gained in Liechtenstein, but to spend holidays, weekends and currency within the boundary of Liechtenstein!

However, it would be a pity to see this flourishing little land sacrificed to New-European restrictionism.

The Critics Criticized

By JACOB SCHWARTZMAN

"SO I object—" said Ko-Ko, in the famous operetta by Gilbert and Sullivan, "The Mikado." And to emphasize his point, he repeated this twice more.

Looking through the ponderous tomes which have been written by serious-minded "economists"—men who ostensibly are social scientists—I have been struck by the great quantity of nonsense which has passed under the guise of political economy. Especially ridiculous are the objections leveled against Henry George and his "single tax" proposal. A number of the critics, shouting denunciations, seem to think they prove their point, like Ko-Ko, in merely repeating their cavils.

It is my purpose here to criticize the various critics of Henry George, and to answer their objections. But since their name is legion, and a number of them parrot what the standard "authorities" have already professed, I shall pick out only the best-known of these and, after classifying their objections, proceed to refute them. My refutations will be presented in a series of articles, of which this is the first. After individual economists have been answered, I will then summarize the objections which appear most often, arrange them in as few groups as practicable, and answer them collectively.

F. W. Taussig

(Frank William Taussig was born in 1859. He died this year (1940). Among the high positions held by this famous American economist were those of editor-in-chief of the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* and Chairman of the U. S. Tariff Commission (1917-19). He was a professor of Economics at Harvard from 1882 to 1935, and the author of many books on economics—Ed.)

I follow no set order in presenting these authorities. I shall do that only when summarizing at the end of the series. I begin with the first prosecutor, F. W. Taussig (recently deceased). He states his objections to the single tax in his "Principles of Economics," Volume II (third edition, Macmillan, 1936), on pp. 80-82. This noted economist criticizes George's remedy by interposing the following so-called obstacles:

1—There is the difficulty of measuring the investment made in the soil, and the normal return on it. In other words, rent is inextricably intermixed with the complex process of tilling the soil, and of maintaining its fertility. If rent is to be carved out of the final produce, how can you be sure that it doesn't cut into the amount due to labor for its work?

2—The single tax will have the tendency to discourage the tenant to cultivate the soil, for the more he produces,

the more will the government take from him in the tax; while, at present, the owner of the soil receives the best stimulus to the best use of the land from the knowledge — that all he tills will go to him.

3—It is admitted that if the nation at its birth had started owning land, it might be all right. But once private ownership arises, as it has arisen all over the world with the birth of each country, it would be socialistic to change such private ownership, especially since it has acted as a spur for the advance of agricultural arts.

4—The author does not object, however, to the collection by society of all the rent that will arise hereafter. In fact, he feels it might be all right, except that it would call for high intelligence and scrupulous honesty among public officials. A dull or corrupt administration would work great harm, and would probably lead to the abandonment of the whole program.

And so, while the writer admits a certain injustice in permitting private ownership of land, he feels a greater injustice would be worked upon the people if land were owned socially, and therefore picks, as it seems to him, the lesser of the two evils.

Looking upon the four obstacles as a whole, I would say that there is really only one objection presented, the rest being but detailed subdivisions. However, we shall accept Taussig's classifications, and attempt to attack each of them.

(1)

Beginning with the first, we might observe that this objection is the one most commonly used by the standard economists, and one which Henry George himself foresaw. We shall therefore allow him to answer it:

" . . . For admitting that it is impossible invariably to separate the value of land from the value of improvements, is this necessity of continuing to tax *some* improvements any reason why we should continue to tax *all* improvements? If it discourage production to tax values which labor and capital have intimately combined with that of land, how much greater discouragement is involved in taxing not only these, but all the clearly distinguishable values which labor and capital create?"

"But, as a matter of fact, the value of land can always be readily distinguished from the value of improvements. In countries like the United States there is much valuable land that has never been improved; and in many of the States the value of the land and the value of improvements are habitually estimated separately by the assessors, though afterward reunited under the term real estate. Nor where

ground has been occupied from immemorial times, is there any difficulty in getting at the value of the bare land, for frequently the land is owned by one person and the buildings by another, and when a fire occurs and improvements are destroyed, a clear and definite value remains in the land. In the oldest country in the world no difficulty whatever can attend the separation, if all that be attempted is to separate the value of the clearly distinguishable improvements, made within a moderate period, from the value of the land, should they be destroyed." ("Progress and Poverty", Fiftieth Anniversary Edition, pp. 425-6.)

George goes on to explain that this is all that justice requires. Absolute accuracy would be impossible. Each generation builds for itself, and is not concerned whether the improvements of today will pass into the value of the land tomorrow. Each new generation inherits the work of the previous generations.

I might add, in further refutation, that if there are two practically identical parcels of land side by side in a community, and one is developed, while the other is not, both would have to pay an identical rent to the government, under the single tax plan, such rent being based upon the extent of the demand for land, and not upon the improvements on it. Whatever is produced by labor (on marginal land) would not be taxed.

(2)

The second objection could be taken to mean two different things, and we shall therefore reply to both of them. If Taussig means that the reason the people will discontinue cultivating the soil is because it is hard to distinguish between the value of the land and the value of their own production, and that they might therefore be taxed on what they produced, then I will reply by pointing out that this is really the first objection, and that we have already answered it. If he means that they will be discouraged from production because of the uncertainty of tenure, then I will reply: (a) that in a rent-collecting state, tenure will never be disturbed, so long as rent is paid; and (b) that even today, lease tenants, and in many cases, tenants without leases, have worked improvements upon the land. Far from being discouraged from cultivating land under the single tax, the tenant will be encouraged to improve the land, knowing of a certainty that the result of his increased efforts will truly belong to him, whereas under the system which now prevails he as certainly knows that "all he tills will go to him" (Taussig), *after the various tax-gatherers have taken their shares*.

Also, in the second objection, I wish to take issue with the assertion that the owner of the soil receives a stimulus to put the land to the best use. On the contrary, it has been our sad experience to observe that the *owner* often keeps his land untilled and uncultivated, because of the

speculative gains he anticipates without the necessity of any toil on his part. Under common ownership of land, he will be forced to use the land, or forego it from the consequent inability to pay rent. It should be emphasized that Taussig refers throughout to agricultural land only. Our remedy would apply to all land, rural and urban alike.

(3)

The third objection is plain nonsense. The author's opinion that public ownership of the land at the beginning of a nation's life might be well and good, but should not now be practiced, is ridiculous. Why, if it would be all right at the beginning, should it not be all right now? Does the economist mean to imply that a mere status quo should be relied upon to "justify" a wrong?

Taussig also justifies private ownership of land on historic grounds. If it arose all over the world, for him it must be valid. In making an estimate of this kind, he is guilty of serious acts of omission. History also shows that there have been wars without end, depressions, misery, poverty, religious strife, plagues, epidemics, and ruthless persecutions. Must these also be accepted because history discloses they have existed since time immemorial? As a matter of fact, at the beginning of each country, common ownership of land is least needed, since there is still enough free land to limit the advantages which accrue from the appropriation of superior land. I am not now justifying that private land-ownership in new countries is harmless, but merely exposing the illogic of Taussig's assertion.

By calling the proposed change "socialism," Taussig evidently supposes that he has forever silenced the believers of Henry George. Name-calling means nothing. The *function* of the definition is the important thing. Nor is it now necessary to dispute in detail the contention that Georgeism is socialism. I will take that up in a subsequent article. Suffice to say for the moment that it is not.

(4)

The fourth objection is farcical. Here Taussig is in favor of the idea of permitting the state to collect future rents. Therefore, he believes (summarizing the third and the fourth objections) that "single tax" is good when applied to ancient times; and is also good when applied to any future increment. But if it is good for both extremes, why should it not be good throughout and for all time, and for all rents? Why, if private ownership is wrong, must we appropriate only future unearned increments? That would leave the basic wrong unremedied, and allow to remain the injustice which is admitted.

Besides—and here he squarely contradicts himself—if it is so difficult to determine what portion of tilled land is personal property, how would it be possible to determine what part of future "rent" might or might not include

personal property, in addition to the increment in the value of land itself?

Our noted economist seems to believe that the single tax is good in the respect embraced in his last two paragraphs, but feels that it would be difficult to attain honesty and intelligence from public officials, and therefore, the plan would fail. However, if that were so, we could use the same argument in advising against the use of electricity, because a great injustice is being inflicted by the people selling it to us. If that were so, we should refuse to take any more cancer treatments because the specialist we employed was inefficient. And yet, ridiculous as these examples must appear, they are equally applicable to the notion that even though a theory might be correct, it would fail because those who administered it *might be* dishonest.

In truth, under a system where wealth would tend to be equalized, the reasons for dishonesty, and even lack of intelligence, in public officials would tend to disappear. And if the officials did prove to be incapable, in a community where every one understood his civic relations this would merely result in a change of administrators. And a just plan, as advocated by George, where all will have a stake in the government, must presuppose the development of such an intelligent and wide-awake community.

I trust I have dispatched the contentions of Taussig. In future issues I shall examine other luminaries who share with him the spotlight of economic "knowledge."

The Land Question In Roumania and Hungary

ILLUMINATING as to the causes of misery and therefore of strife and war is the article on the leading article page of the *Glasgow Herald*, September 4. At the time of writing the author spoke of the extraordinary wave of feeling which was sweeping over Transylvania. It had its roots in something deeper than national patriotism. It is the land hunger of the peasant who, hardly more than a serf before the last war, was first granted land of his own and an independent existence under the Roumanian Government, and who sees this independence threatened by union with a country where semi-feudal conditions still exist.

For obvious reasons politicians on neither side have cared to dwell upon this problem. But Dr. Maniu, who started life himself as a landless peasant under the old Hungarian regime, understands it very well. His personal character and his well-known love for his native Province have gained him a powerful following, not only among the Roumanians of the north, but quite possibly among the younger Hungarian peasants who are loath to return, for purely sentimental reasons, to the state of landless dependence which will almost certainly be their lot under Hungarian rule.

Thanks to the Agrarian Reform brought in by Roumania after the last war, each Transylvanian peasant could own his own small croft, and was not obliged to work for a return in kind from his Hungarian overlord. It is safe to assume that this condition of affairs will not long remain once most of Transylvania is in Hungarian hands again. The Magyar-Transylvania noble families, which include those of Count Teleki, Count Bethlen, and other leaders of Hungarian Nationalism, have long felt exceedingly bitter at Roumanian partition of their once-great estates among the peasants after the last war.

For 20 years now those families have looked across the frontier and seen their relatives in Hungary proper enjoying the privileges long superseded in the modern world. Now, however, the new frontiers will enclose them safely in Greater Hungary, and it will probably be only a question of time before the antique Hungarian system of land tenure will once more restore their estates to them in full—at the expense of Roumanian and Hungarian peasant alike.

The land problem, too, was at the root of Hungary's indignant refusal of Roumania's first offer of an exchange of populations. Probably the fulfilment of this offer was dreaded by the Transylvanians themselves as much as any frontier changes, however drastic. The mere transference of the Magyar minority across the border would have taken no account of the estates and small holdings left behind them, land which in the aggregate came to a handsome proportion of Hungarian-Transylvania nobles' old property. The peasants themselves could have been under no delusion that Hungary would treat them any better than she has treated her own landless population; while their influx into the already over-populated rural villages, where it is sometimes a problem to devise labor for all, would merely have brought hardship to the districts concerned, as well as dire poverty to the transplanted. Exchange of populations only works where there is nothing to lose. (*Land & Liberty*)

FROM J. Rupert Mason we have just received the following: "Oklahoma voted November 5th on a graduated land tax law, and the vote was 408,559 yes to 196,711 no. But, because this got on the ballot as an initiative measure, it needed a majority of *all* votes cast that day, which it missed by just a few hundred. Tom Cheek led the fight as president of the Oklahoma Farmers' Union. I am told that nearly all the Oklahoma papers viciously opposed it, so the vote result is all the more significant. This may be a tonic for some Georgeists who are suffering from a what's-the-use complex. I am told that a similar measure was voted the same day in North and South Dakota, but haven't the vote totals."

A FREE COPY of LAND AND FREEDOM is an invitation to become a subscriber.

Honoré Daumier

HONORE DAUMIER was a remarkable French artist of the nineteenth century who drew political cartoons for various liberal periodicals. Though regarded as simply a clever caricaturist in his day, he is now recognized to be one of the world's great artists, with a brilliant gift of deep insight into humanity. His keen pictorial comments on the issues of his day have a universal quality—they are also comments on our own day. He seems to have touched eternal verities.

Daumier was deeply concerned with the welfare of the people. He was angered over their oppression, and lashed out against their oppressors. Because he championed the cause of the "common man," he is claimed by the Marxists as an artistic champion of the "class struggle." In truth, however, Daumier comes nearer to Georgeist than to Marxist thought. Were he alive today, it is not unlikely that he would embrace the Georgeist cause. The shortcoming in the Marxist claim is evidenced by his cartoons depicting Commerce as champion of the right of initiative and enterprise in industry. What Daumier did stand for was Democracy and Freedom, Justice and Tolerance.

Honore Daumier was born at Marseilles in 1808. Most of his life was spent in illustration for such journals as *La Silhouette*, *Le Monde Illustré*, *La Caricature*, and *Charivari*. He was once imprisoned for a caricature of



COMMERCE (to Politicians):—Gentlemen, when are you going to finish playing that game? . . . I'm getting tired of paying all the expenses of your party!

"The present method of taxation . . . operates upon energy, and industry, and skill, and thrift, like a fine upon those qualities."

—*Progress and Poverty*.

King Louis Philippe. He died, nearly blind, in 1879.

Mr. Anthony Bertram has written an essay on Daumier, some of which will be worth quoting here:

"Daumier chose to display their (the people's) wrongs, their sufferings, their sorrows. Outside the crowd there are the lawyers, the soldiers, the rulers; them he shows as the cause of wrongs, sufferings, and sorrows. At least, that was how, as a political cartoonist, he saw them; but he gave them such individuality, such intense vitality, that we realize that they also are Tom, Dick and Harry, though for the moment they are playing the part of this or the other abstraction, the law, the army or the ruling class. It is this reality, this individuality of his people, that makes Daumier's exposure of a topical grievance into an exposure of all humanity.

"From the stuffy little offices of radical journals, from prison, from the barricades, from his garret, Daumier looked out on a vast concourse of human beings. . . To the world he was a poor persecuted hack; but his kingdom was all mankind."

The Daumier cartoons reproduced here are from *Charivari*, and they range in date from 1850 to 1870. We present them through the kindness of Mr. Francis Neilson. The cartoons are accompanied with quotations from Henry George, to illustrate the similarity in thought.



COMMERCE (to Politicians):—How do you expect me to make headway if you always hold me back?

"These are the substitution of governmental direction for the play of individual action, and the attempt to secure by restriction what can better be secured by freedom."

—*Progress and Poverty*.



THE PEOPLE JUDGE THE BLOWS.

“Under all forms of government the ultimate power lies with the masses . . . The working-men of the United States may mold to their will legislatures, courts and constitutions. Politicians strive for their favor and political parties bid against one another for their vote.”

—Protection or Free Trade.



THE REIMBURSEMENT OF 45 CENTIMES
NEW TRICK INVENTED BY THE CELEBRATED BERRYER

—See, my friend, I take this 5-franc piece out of this pocket (tax of 45 centimes), and I pass it over to your other pocket (tax on salt) . . . It is then very clear that you're a hundred sous to the advantage. . . *Cri, craque!* . . . The trick is done!



—My field plundered. . . my horse taken. . . my money stolen. . . That's what they call patriotism!

“That, as declared by the French Assembly, public misfortunes and corruptions of government spring from ignorance, neglect or contempt of human rights, may be seen from whatever point we look.”

—Social Problems.



LIBERTY (to War):—Pardon, my dear, let's try out my powers before yours! . . .

“Who is Liberty that we should doubt her; that we should set bounds to her, and say, ‘Thus far shall thou come and no farther!’ Is she not peace? is she not prosperity? is she not progress?”

—The American Republic.

Georgeism, Thomism, And The Catholic Question

By ROBERT C. LUDLOW

(An article on "Georgeism and Thomism" by Mr. Ludlow appeared in the March-April 1940 issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. In that article, the author discussed the possibility of a mutual assimilation of the doctrines of the followers of Henry George and those of Thomas Aquinas. In the present treatment, Mr. Ludlow elaborates his ideas.—Ed.)

THERE is nothing novel in suggesting Thomistic borrowing from another philosophic system. For, after all, the Thomist is an eclectic—he has borrowed much, and that from divergent and often strange sources. The founder of his system preferred Aristotle to the Christian Augustine — not, it is true, Aristotle in synthesis — but Aristotle as laying the rational foundation upon which a true synthesis could be based. And I say a true synthesis could only then come because Aristotle lacked knowledge of revelation—a corrective that must be taken into account if any really full and vital outlook (other than the mediocrity of a "golden mean") is to be reached. Aristotle, as it were, waited for Thomas Aquinas to crown and enlarge and correct his philosophical system. And this was done within the framework of Catholicism. For with the transformation of the nationalist Judaic revelation into the universal message of Christianity it was seemly that a philosophical system admitting the objective and universal should be utilized as the rational foundation from which one could then proceed to higher things. Nor is it strange that the Christian Aquinas leaned toward the pagan Stag-irite—it was to be expected that a revelation bursting the bonds of Judaism should assimilate the Gentile as well as the Jewish outlook. The Roman Church has always been the great assimilator. At the risk of scandalizing some she has not hesitated to use what was true and beautiful in the pagan creeds, while at the same time keeping the riches of Israel in her bosom. I have heard it said—why does the Roman Church approve of Aristotle and not Plato? And the answer is, of course, that she sanctions what is true in both Aristotle and Plato, but that most of her children feel that Aristotle laid the more solid foundation upon which the "higher things" might rest.

Because the Thomist is an eclectic, his system is not yet complete. Or rather, let us say he has the framework—part of it is filled in and a great deal more remains to be filled. It may take years or even centuries of dispute before this or that is dropped into its proper niche within this framework. There is no need to despair entirely if there seems to be no indication of any great understanding between Georgeists and Thomists. For the Thomist is slow to enthusiasm, holds emotional response in distrust and, because he has a long memory, looks upon no economic

system as fully proved. For those whose outlook stops at the borders of reason there will be more trust in a professed cure here and now than for those looking "sub specie aeternitatis." The combination of these elements in Catholicism works unrest in many a soul. The mentally healthy will try to hit the right balance, but many there are who will not be able to do this and to whom the Church extends an uneasy indulgence.

Catholicism and Thomism are not synonymous terms—allegiance to one is no guarantee of allegiance to the other—nevertheless it is within the larger framework of Catholicism that the Thomist philosophy works itself out. So it is that the acts of ecclesiastical authority will have bearing on the question of assimilation. And that, of course, brings up the McGlynn affair. In Catholic circles (particularly in Jesuit circles) we hear much of Dr. McGlynn's excommunication and small mention of his eventual vindication, and to these we can only extend the reminder of the excommunication of Thomas Aquinas and his eventual vindication — sometimes the Church has wrestled with angels. But, after all, there is a contradiction (or apparently one) between the usual school of Catholic thought and that of the Georgeists. And that does not lie in the land doctrine—rather does it lie in the question of what economics is and whether man *makes* his economic laws or *discovers* them.

Thomas Aquinas did not regard either politics or economics as physical sciences—but rather as branches of ethics—treating them as subdivisions of moral theology. He held that they dealt with human actions and were therefore susceptible of moral judgment and so did not admit of treatment as given to laws of medicine or chemistry. Henry George felt quite otherwise. He contended that there was indeed a science of political economy and that it was a natural science and that its laws were discovered, not made, and that therefore they were to be treated as one would treat the laws of mechanics and physics. This does not mean that George ruled ethics out of economics—far from it. But ethical considerations, with him, did not enter into economic law *as such*. Rather, these laws worked out automatically and inevitably, like the law of gravitation. Ethical judgment concerned itself with how man *used* these laws. George held that natural economic law tended to the common good if left untouched and he judged unethical the attempt to interfere with these laws—be it the socialist attempt at planning or the attempt to manipulate economic law to benefit the few. In this, his viewpoint differs sharply from that of the Malthusian-minded economists. For these latter also, economics was a physical

science, but a science whose working out tended, not as George held, to the common good, but rather to the benefit of the few at the top. For them there was no ethical judgment, either in relation to economics in itself or in man's actions. For George there was no ethical judgment in relation to economics in itself (as there is no ethical judgment of the law of gravitation) but there was ethical judgment in regard to man's manipulation of these laws. For the Thomist, ethical judgment enters both fields—that of personal action and that of economics proper, since for them man *makes* his economic system.

This, then, and not the land dispute, is the question that offers the more fundamental difficulty—does man *make* or *discover* the economic law? And if the question cannot be dissolved, can there still be made a working agreement among Thomists who assert the former and Georgeists who teach the latter?

Another disagreement more fundamental than that of the land question is that concerning freedom. Regulation is never desirable in itself—if we must have it, then let it be because it leads to a truer freedom than otherwise. And so one approaches the Georgean concept of freedom in economic life and intellectual life with favorable bias. This preparation of mind is a necessary preliminary to any investigation. It is sheerest fiction to say that we can approach problems disinterestedly. Time spent on the question of disinterested versus interested investigation would be as wasted as that spent on the question of motivated versus unmotivated actions. If nothing else prevents a disinterested investigation, our very physical make-up does so. A man disapproves of many things from a sour stomach or he is "intellectually" convinced of the absurdity of ethical standards, because he prefers unlawful sensual pleasure. Once, a young man came to the Cure d'Arts to argue against the Faith. He was advised the confessional, after which he could no longer remember what his "intellectual difficulties" had been. A man does not approach the problem of immortality, or of the existence of God, or the permanence of the marriage bond, in a disinterested way—he hopes for one answer rather than another. This is no necessary hindrance to discovering truth—because the very idea of truth must contain the psychological make-up of man in it and, if we can emancipate ourselves from mere prejudice as distinguished from a natural and legitimate "interestedness" we need feel no hesitancy but that man is capable of finding truth.

The Thomist is predisposed to admit the necessity of limited freedom—the Georgeist at times talks of "unlimited" freedom, but a second thought usually shows him the fallacy of this, especially when it's a question of "unlimited" freedom for the landlord. But the idea of freedom as an end in itself towards which the economic system should

aim persists in Georgean literature. And there is the truth in it that if the common good is best served by a free economy then we need the free economy. But the end is the common good, not freedom. The most perfect physical pleasure of which we are capable here is the act of coition in which body and soul are surrendered to another, so that volitional freedom itself is inoperative during the unitive act. And in that parallel act which is the perfect consummation of eternal happiness—the coitional surrender to God which is the Beatific Vision—freedom has found its object and is assimilated. So that neither the performance of the earthly act of union or its divine counterpart count on freedom as an *end*; rather it is the means making possible the end and becomes inoperative with the attainment of that end.

This holds true of the economic life also. If there is any purpose in having a free system, it is to serve the common good. Georgeism remains little more than a nicely worked out plan or an exercise in logic unless it can demonstrate its worth and be considered both as a practical system and a system conducive to the physical and spiritual good of the community. Freedom is always desirable and preferable as a means to any end. If the end be temporal it must foster freedom (forced coitional union is rape); if it be eternal it must postulate freedom as a condition to that end (one attains the Beatific Vision voluntarily or not at all).

These two problems, then—the nature of economics and the nature of freedom — form the basis for discussing Georgeism, Thomism and the Catholic Question. Let us hope they will be thrashed out by competent Thomists and Georgists, and not remain just material for a short article to gather dust in Limbo.

. . .

Poverty

By THEOGNIS

(Greek—Sixth Century B. C.)

FOR noble minds, the worst of miseries,
 Worse than old age, or wearisome disease,
 Is Poverty. From Poverty to flee
 From some tall precipice into the sea,
 It were a fair escape to leap below!
 In Poverty, dear Kyrnus, we forego
 Freedom in word and deed, body and mind;
 Action and thought are fetter'd and confin'd.
 Let me then fly, dear Kyrnus, once again!
 Wide as the limits of the land and main,
 From these entanglements; with these in view,
 Death is the lighter evil of the two.

The Battle Of The Towns

English Municipal Campaigns

By DOUGLAS J. J. OWEN

SOME of the finest hours in English history, when not taken up with crowns and dynasties, have been those which tell of the long struggle for freedom of the boroughs, towns and cities. John Richard Green, in his "Short History of the English People," says: "In the silent growth and elevation of the English people the boroughs led the way . . . The rights of self-government, of free speech in free meeting, of equal justice by one's equals, were brought safely across the ages of tyranny by the burghers and shopkeepers of the towns."

This was written of the period from the Norman Conquest onwards. The struggle was against tolls, privileges and monopolies of all kinds. "Land," says Green, "was from the first the test of freedom, and the possession of land was what constituted the townsman." But he goes on to say: "In England the landless man who dwelled in a borough had no share in its corporate life; for purposes of government or property the town was simply an association of the landed proprietors within its bounds." So that, against the merchant guilds composed of the landed burghers, there arose the craft guilds of the landless townworkers. "The longest and bitterest strife of all," we read, "was naturally at London. Nowhere had the territorial constitution struck so deeply, and nowhere had the landed oligarchy risen to such a height of wealth and influence." About the year 1196 it was "the unfair assessment levied on the poor, and the undue burthens which were thrown on the unenfranchised classes, which provoked the first serious discontent."

This discontent exists unremedied at the present time. "Unfair assessments levied on the poor" are still the main feature of municipal life. The complete freedom of the English towns in local affairs is yet to be won. It is hardly credible that the great cities which sprang up after the Industrial Revolution, almost as rapidly as the American cities described by Henry George—Manchester, Glasgow, Birmingham, Liverpool, each with a million inhabitants—have no local option in the method of raising their municipal revenue. The assessments levied on the poor townpeople are as unfair as in 1196. Local authorities are bound by statutes passed in Queen Elizabeth's time 340 years ago. The Industrial Revolution and the Great War have made no difference in that. In the valuation of property no distinction is allowed to be made between the land and the improvements upon it. The site and the super-structure must be taken together, and no attempt is made to assess the true economic value of the land alone. This unscientific provision may have made little difference in Elizabeth's

day. It is working havoc in the finances of the great industrial and commercial centres of modern times.

The huge totals of municipal indebtedness constitute a second National Debt, imposing an enormous burden of interest payments, which falls mainly on the small householders. The level of local taxation, or "rates," rises inexorably in spite of the strictest economy and the reduction of necessary social services. Vacant land and vacant property escapes local taxation, and owners of valuable city sites are thus encouraged to withhold their land from its true economic use. Thus the community can neither use the land it has made valuable, nor secure the values it has created thereon.

A striking example of the effect of these local taxation laws is shown by the Bill passed last year enabling municipalities to exempt from local taxes any increases in the value of properties due to the erection of Air-Raid Shelters (See *Land and Liberty*, June 1938, p. 82). Special legislation was thus required to free our local authorities from the obligation they would have been under to impose local taxes upon the value of the people's protection from bombs. Thus the Government also admits that taxation levied on improvements discourages the making of them. But it is only protection against bombs that is to be now encouraged—protection against rain and cold, the houses which people need to live in, are still to be taxed and rated as before.

It is no wonder that in the face of such anomalies there has grown up a public sentiment in this country for the principle of land value taxation for local as well as national purposes. A principal evidence of this is the long agitation of the municipalities for freedom to levy taxes (or "rates") on land values separately from improvements. The numerous resolutions in favor of this change, and the action taken in following them up, would not have been carried out by Councillors and M. P.'s if it were not for their being pressed forward by their constituents.

The people of this country are as much awake to the "aggression" of land-monopoly as they are to the outside aggressor. The ceaseless work of educating the public in Henry George's principles has been carried on by the United Committee and all its associated Leagues until there is now a wide appreciation of our basic principle. It is no mere "rating reform" that is in question but a step forward in the struggle of the towns and their citizens for fundamental justice.

I guess our American friends would consider it a great thing if any of their cities were doing as Cardiff did in 1935—taking a definite lead on this question; passing its

resolution in favor of this fundamental change; inviting all other municipalities to a Conference demanding the necessary legislation; and communicating its declarations far and wide. Here is one instance of the "campaign", and it is only fair to remember work done by the United Committee, and by the International Union for the Taxation of Land Values, in support of the Cardiff initiative. It should be repeated that such action as that of Cardiff could not have been undertaken but for the urge of public opinion already created.

Since 1919, to go no farther back, resolutions calling for power to levy local taxes on land values have been passed by more than 235 local authorities, including such great cities as London, Glasgow and Cardiff. Not only has this individual action been taken, but a number of them have from time to time organized Conferences of Municipal Authorities, as in the case of Cardiff, for the purpose of influencing Parliament to grant them the necessary powers. Many have set up special "Rating" (local taxation) Committees to investigate the question, and have published valuable Reports, such as that of Sheffield in 1928, now one of the publications (No. 77) of the Henry George Foundation of Great Britain. Like other municipalities Sheffield had a long and bitter experience of the exactions of city landlords when land was required for schools, playing grounds, hospitals, and other public purposes. The city saw the values it was creating by its public expenditure being diverted into private channels by our effete taxation laws. It had good reason for its Report which has had a wide and influential circulation. Similar Reports were made by Newcastle-on-Tyne, Stoke on Trent, and others.

Special mention should be made of the Report on the question of the Finance Committee of the London County Council and the Bill which was its consequence. Just as, when the Land Value Tax in the 1931 Budget was repealed, a large number of municipalities passed resolutions of protest, so, when the L. C. C.'s Bill was being considered by Parliament, numbers of local authorities sent up resolutions of support.

This incident in the age-long battle of the towns is one of the most significant. In 1936 the London County Council, that great and influential body, decided to demand legislation from the Government to enable it to tax land values. But its demand was refused by a Parliament in which the influence of landowners is paramount. The Council then decided to prepare and introduce a Bill of its own which would have been a "Private Bill" since it applied only to its own area. Again the Council was frustrated. It will be appreciated what great importance attached to this determination shown by our greatest local government body and how its fortunes were followed by the rest of the country. The landed interests, whilst they opposed the proposal in the press, knew of course that a majority would vote against

it in the House of Commons, but they shunned any debate on it in the House, as they knew it could only help the agitation in the country for the land value policy. They therefore secured a ruling by the Speaker that such a proposal could not proceed by way of a Private Bill. For the time being the issue was decided on a technicality of procedure.

It should be mentioned that Mr. F. C. R. Douglas, who is chairman of the L. C. C. Finance Committee, and now, happily, a Member of Parliament, took a leading and determining part in all these proceedings. There can be no doubt that his statesmanship, his quiet, persistent, and genial conduct of controversy and debate from beginning to end were largely responsible for this triumph for our movement. Warm tributes were paid him by opponents as well as by friends. It has been well said that there are two ways of hitting a fellow, one is in the solar plexus, the other is by way of a pat on the back. One is the way of a certain type of propagandists, of angering and estranging their opponents. The other is that which has resulted from the L.C.C. debates. The Labor Party came to see the virtue of land value "rating", and schemes like the local income tax and other palliatives have been killed stone dead so far as London is concerned. The adoption of the land value principle for local taxation by the London Labor Party has done more to turn them toward the appreciation of the Henry George solution of the poverty problem than reams of wordy debate with its "ad hoc" fling at Socialism. A case in point:—The representative of an important assessment authority called recently at the United Committee offices. He said he had been an ardent and uncompromising Socialist but now as a practical man, obliged to look into the "rating" problem, he has come to see that the Henry George plan is the right one.

The important thing in the L. C. C.'s Bill was not the "rate in the pound" (i. e. the percentage of the tax levy); it was the fact of the Bill itself and the principle it stood for, the fact of the London County Council challenging a reactionary House of Commons, the fact of the nation-wide propaganda that came out of the Bill. The echoes of that fight have by no means died down. The war itself has not suspended the agitation. On July 31, the Derby Town Council on the recommendation of its Audit and Finance Committee passed a resolution urging the Government to empower local authorities to levy local taxes on site value. On the same day a similar resolution was debated by the Smethwick Town Council. The reports of these debates are given in *Land & Liberty* for September 1940. And so the battle of the towns goes on, war or no war, justifying the words of A. W. Madsen at the time of the L. C. C. ruling: "The determination of the municipalities and of the advocates and friends of the land value policy to knock still louder at the door of Parliament has been powerfully stimulated by this setback, hastening the day when the Government in power must enact the necessary legislation".

A Challenge To Pessimism

By W. R. B. WILLCOX

IN its generous and frank presentation of views of the speakers at the recent Henry George Congress, the September-October LAND AND FREEDOM offers sad, if salutary, testimony to the present state of progress towards Henry George's goal—the governmental collection of the Rent and the abolition of Taxation.

However, the noticeable disuse of the term "single tax," which some may regard as of very minor importance, should be distinctly encouraging to others. In 1934, a contributor noted that in the previous issue the factor Rent had been mentioned four or five times, while the term "single tax" had appeared no less than 138 times. In the last issue (except for a dozen appearances in the names of Single Tax Clubs) the term is used only 10 times. One may rejoice to think that it may become obsolete in another year or two, removing the embarrassment of explaining that "the single tax isn't a tax, anyway—it is Rent."

Otherwise, Georgeists may well be filled with consternation if they reflect seriously upon the direction in which they are moving. Henry J. Foley in your "The Road Ahead" number, believes "that in our efforts to spread the doctrine of Henry George, we are now engaged in sweeping back the tides." Benjamin C. Marsh, after citing existing conditions and trends, said: "Readers may think I have painted a rather dark picture. I hope events may prove me wrong, but I doubt it." Sanford J. Benjamin said: "There is a dangerous growth of optimism among Georgeists at present which bodes ill for the success of the movement." He cites as reasons for his apprehension that "the conditions of a privileged economy do not permit peaceful reform," that "Georgeists fail when they speak about peaceful solution of the world's evil through the ballot." He quotes Marx as authority for the view that "Transfer to power can only be accomplished through force," and asks: "How can we expect that Georgeists will not have to take up arms to free the land?"

But those who think they see the bright star of Henry George's goal; who think that through the years they have been plodding towards it; who, within their lights, have striven to dispel the fog which obscured it from others, should search their souls as they read the following paragraph from Mr. Benjamin's "The Price of Freedom."

"First, no special privilege is as time honored by rich and poor alike as land ownership. In fact the privilege of owning land is considered a successful goal. One does not have to be a Georgeist in order to predict that land owners would fight land reform. The Spanish civil war was essentially an uprising of landlords when the government attempted to break up their estates;

and far from acknowledging the right of the people to cultivate the land, the so-called democratic nations backed the insurrectionists. It should not be overlooked that, in order to hold on to their privilege, the land owners called in foreign soldiers—a lesson Georgeists should ponder when they think of achieving their reform in any one country."

Where has it more clearly been implied that Georgeists are a body of land reformers, a minority in opposition, fighting against "landlordism" which they see as evil, instead of for the governmental collection of the Rent which they know is righteous? This evidence of obsession with "land" disinters ideas which have lain dead since the days of "Progress and Poverty." Whose task, but that of Georgeists, to revivify them? Let us look at some of them as questions to be answered.

To begin with, why do Georgeists antagonize, or want to fight, landlords? Will there not of necessity always be landlords to administer the land to which they hold titles? Will not landlords be necessary to collect the Rent from tenants and to turn it over to the government, together with the Rent they themselves owe to society in the services which society renders to both of them? Why inconsistently call landlords, "land owners"? Do Georgeists believe there are such things as land *owners*? Is that the reason they can look forward only to the necessity of taking the land away from landlords by force? If they will mistakenly call landlords by that name, a number of questions are bound to arise in the minds of the ignorant. How are these questions to be answered?

Would Georgeists object because an automobile owner gets the Rent paid for the use of his automobile? If not, why should they object because a land owner gets the Rent paid for the use of his land? Would they contend that the public should get the Rent paid for the use of an automobile owner's automobile? If not, on what grounds would they contend that the public should get the Rent paid for the use of a land owner's land? On the other hand, would Georgeists contend that the land owner should not get the Rent because he does not own the land? If so, would they contend that the public should get the Rent because the public owns the land? Does the question as to who shall get the Rent rest upon a decision as to who owns the land?

Georgeists should know that the so-called land owner's claim to ownership, weak as it is, is far stronger than that of the public. He usually can submit a title deed in legal evidence of ownership, which in most instances is more than the public can do. Would Georgeists contend that

so-called land owners should not get the Rent because they are fewer than non-land owners; hence, that (in a democratic country!) a majority, properly propagandized, could vote to take the land (and the Rent) away from a minority by taxation? Do they agree with so-called land owners that for the public to get the Rent by taxation is to "confiscate" the land of these land owners?

If force is to be the arbiter in this case, Georgeists should know that the decision will go to these land owners, who have all of the legal, educational, financial and military, power in their hands; and that to oppose this power means persecution and civil war. But do Georgeists agree with those they call land owners that a nation, by conquering the people of another nation, becomes owner of the land of the conquered people? That to be patriotic, people should be willing to fight to get the land of another people, or to hold it for their own land owners? That to live on this earth some people either must fight, or pay, other people before the land can be used?

Do Georgeists agree with those they call land owners, that holders of titles to areas of land, to that extent, are owners of the earth—owners of climates, views, mines, forests, harbors, rivers, soils? That fighting for, or paying for, land affects the land? That people pay Rent because the earth, with all of its natural elements and forces, *exists*? That people pay Rent for the use of the *land*? Why longer "kick against the pricks"? Does hope lie in this direction?

But there is hope! The star which Henry George beheld still shines. Its penetrating rays illumine still farther reaches of the path which he discerned. Shall men not venture nearer to the goal he sought; beyond the point which he attained? Would he not bid them push on? Men know not the purposes of creation. They never may know how men came to inhabit this earth. But they know, if they are to live, that their livelihoods must be toiled from the earth; that they must have access to the provisions of nature—the land. Therefore, men want land! So desperately do men want land that, down through the ages, if not otherwise to be had, men have fought—and still fight—to possess the land. If, as a result of accumulated knowledge and experience, men learned that it was not necessary to burn buildings to provide themselves with roast pig, may not the accumulated knowledge and experience of the present day teach them wisdom as to how to obtain their livelihoods without fighting, or paying, to possess the land?

Is it possible that any considerable number of Georgeists are becoming merely another group such as socialists or communists—blindly, fanatically, adhering to still another "ism," hypocritically denouncing the evil doctrine of Karl Marx of the inevitability of a class war between Labor and Capital, while, as short-sightedly, propounding a doctrine no less evil, the inevitability of a class war between land-

lords and non-landlords; that people must continue to be plunged into new hatreds and civil war? Have any considerable number of Georgeists lost faith in the power of Truth and Justice to bring Peace to this world?

Can this explain the paradox, that while a great array of eminent men, for decades, have acclaimed the outstanding mentality of Henry George, and the luminous quality of his social philosophy, they have ignored its possible implications, and have refused to investigate the causes of its lack of practicality in the progress of civilization? These discuss endlessly the relations of Labor and Capital, and the use and productivity of the land, but tacitly ignore the essentiality of the factor Rent which is present in every social and economic problem. Is it a consequence of the failure to search out the true nature and significance of Rent, that people have resorted to every variety of Socialism—communism, fascism, nazism, New Dealism, and a host of other "isms;" that they have discarded the tenets of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, and no longer crave the personal freedom and individual initiative of true American democracy?

In view of the present social and political chaos, would it not be wise, for the moment, for those who call themselves Georgeists, to hold in abeyance the prejudice that Rent is due to the relative productivity of nature, that it is a "gift of nature" without cost to mankind; and instead, (as worthy of investigation) to view it as a measure of the worth, only, of social and governmental advantages—advantages produced at the cost of human toil and necessary to the procurement and use of the provisions of nature? Whatever the cost of a title to land, it is, after all, the cost of the title, not the cost of the land. Land is not produced, furnished or changed, by an exchange of wealth for a title to land.

By processes no man could devise or energize, the mysterious elements and forces of nature bring forth the fruits of the land. Their growth costs men nothing. But to possess these fruits—the results of this inexplicable metamorphosis—men must toil. If they toil not, these "increments," due to the ceaseless processes of nature, will, as men say, wither away, when by no manner of toil can men possess them. The "gifts of nature" are free to men to possess, but to possess them men must toil. For mankind there is no "unearned increment."

In the light of this reasoning, Hope returns! Rent becomes compensation, solely, for the labor and capital expended in providing social and governmental services. Security of possession of land, attested by a title deed, is one, and only one, service of government. Without this service, a title deed would have neither value nor efficacy as protection of the results of toil on, or in, the land to

(Continued on page 190)

Signs of Progress

GEORGEIST ACTIVITIES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

REPORT OF V. G. PETERSON, SECRETARY

CALENDAR—Last year, about Christmas time, the Foundation published its first Henry George wall calendar. The idea proved extremely popular and was an effective instrument of propaganda. Many people wrote us during the year, after seeing this calendar in homes and offices, and some of these inquirers are now making their own study of our philosophy. The success of the calendar has justified our making another one for 1941. It will feature a handsome photograph of Henry George taken at the height of his career. It was generously loaned from her own collection by Henry George's daughter, Anna George de Mille. The date pad will carry inspiring quotations culled from the golden treasury of George's books. The calendar will again sell at twenty-five cents.

CHRISTMAS GIFTS—The giving of George books as Christmas gifts is a time-honored custom which has started thousands of people on the road to clear economic thinking. To encourage this type of giving we are offering special prices on quantity purchases. For instance, five dollars will purchase a full set of the George books in uniform bindings and a copy of "The Philosophy of Henry George," by Dr. George R. Geiger. Five dollars and seventy-five cents will purchase ten copies of our one dollar edition of "Progress and Poverty."

We are wrapping books to be given as Christmas presents in gay holly paper, with greeting tags attached. Individual attention is paid to all gift orders. Last year, about 500 books were sent out from the Foundation as Christmas gifts. This year, we are trying to reach the 1000 mark.

BOOK DEALERS—We have been very much encouraged by the lively interest on the part of our good friends, the book dealers. In the past few weeks, as a result of a special campaign, 200 books were placed with 20 new dealers, who had hitherto not deemed it worthwhile to stock Henry George books. It is worthy of note that dealers in small towns are now welcoming "Progress and Poverty."

FOSTER vs. GEORGE—Along with thousands of our friends who had hoped for Mr. George's election to the Hall of Fame this year, we suffered the disappointment (relative, of course) of learning that the vote was given to Stephen Foster, writer of American folk songs. Sharing honors with Henry George in the "near the top candidates," was Thomas Paine. He received fifty votes to George's forty-seven.

THE SCHOOLS—Last year the Foundation developed a lively interest in the Georgeist philosophy by circularizing the high school teachers of economics. This work had such splendid results that we extended our campaign this autumn to include normal schools throughout the country. Not only are we selling books to the teachers themselves, but are receiving requests for study material to be used in class. Also worthy of mention is the fact that several new colleges have introduced "Progress and Poverty" in their economics courses.

And now, in closing, let me extend the Season's Greetings and best wishes for a happy and busy 1941.

American Association For Scientific Taxation

Readers will recall the "Legislative Plan of Action," prepared by the Association, which appeared in our September-October issue in abridged form. It was a proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the State of New York, and was intended to serve as a model for proposing the Georgeist reform in legislative assemblies.

Since its partial appearance in the last issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, the full, unabridged Plan was printed in the form of galley proofs and sent to numerous persons prominent in Georgeist, civic and educational work, for suggestions and criticism. The general response was enthusiastic, and the Association was gratified to observe the care with which the Plan was read and criticised. It is thus assuming the form of a cooperative work, and will undoubtedly be an important contribution toward the legislative adoption of the Georgeist proposals. Following are excerpts from some of the many letters received:

"The Plan seems to me to be of great merit and I want to wish you all success with it. I am one of those who have been waiting more than fifty years for such action as this."

—Henry Ware Allen, Author.

"If I could share your optimism as to the possibility of bringing about the taxation reforms which you advocate with the speed you desire and also that these reforms in state and local taxation would completely abolish unemployment and poverty, I should say that you have done an excellent job of draftsmanship in the proposed constitutional amendment and legislation."—Harold S. Bittenheim, Editor, *The American City*.

"I cannot see any way to improve this very excellent piece of work."—William E. Clement, Secretary, Benjamin Franklin Research Society.

"I appreciate your sending me the galleys of 'A Legislative Plan of Action.' . . . I do not believe that anybody should be able to derive revenue from the mere ownership of land. But I do not believe that tax measures are the most efficient way of handling the situation. It seems to me that the direct and most effective way would be for society to recover the actual title of all land from private holders. . . . Why not strike directly at the root of the tree?"—Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, Chairman, Dept. of Economics, New York University.

"It is so evident to me that you and your associates have spent so much thought and labor upon your proposed legislation that even though you have invited criticism and suggestions, it would be presumptuous for me to suggest any amendments without previously explaining that I fully realize you may have excellent reasons for preferring the text and the details as already given."—Albert Firmin, former Postmaster, Brooklyn, N. Y.

"The amendments, the bill, and the comment are compositely a succinct statement of Georgean economics; and mixed in a way I never before encountered in legislation. A splendid propaganda as well as legislative document."—Charles H. Ingersoll, President, Manhattan Single Tax Club.

"I think the general plan of not trying to do the whole thing too quickly is sound."—Benjamin C. Marsh, Executive Secretary, People's Lobby, Washington, D. C.

"I question the value of attempting to write Georgeism into law until Georgeists themselves have a more concrete program. I don't think that merely shifting taxes from improvements to land will do any good. I think it has done considerable harm in other places."—Paul Peach, Associate Editor, *The Freeman*.

The Association is now at work carefully sorting and sifting the many suggestions and criticisms offered. When the final draft is put into shape, it will be published in pamphlet form as "A Legislative Framework for the Philosophy of Henry George." A wide distribution is anticipated, as well as concrete results in legislative halls. It should be understood here that the Plan, or Framework, is not being presented as a mere fiscal measure. It is a legislative embodiment of the full Georgeist philosophy in all its strength.

An Amendment to the Constitution of the United States is also being projected. As soon as the work on the State Plan is completed, the Association will endeavor to frame a model Amendment for the Federal Government, covering all the legal and Constitutional points necessary.

The American Association for Scientific Taxation, under the direction of Messrs. Walter Fairchild, Harry C. Maguire, and Charles Jos. Smith, has its tentative headquarters at the office of LAND AND FREEDOM, 150 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. Communications to the Association should be addressed care of this magazine.

Henry George School of Social Science

Two new and very interesting series of lectures have been scheduled for the new auditorium of the School. One is a series of six lectures on "The Forerunners of Henry George," delivered Friday evening, beginning November 15, by Mr. H. D. Bloch. In this series, Mr. Bloch reviews the theory of the land question as presented by thinkers who anticipated George, such as Confucius, Spinoza, Locke, the Physiocrats, Smith, Ricardo, Mill, Marx, Spencer, Ogilvie, and Dove. The second series of lectures, delivered on Tuesday evenings beginning December 3, is on "Origins of the Capitalist Crisis," by Mr. Will Lissner. The admission charge for this latter series is \$1.00. In a series of three talks, Mr. Lissner proposes to outline historically the rise of the capitalist system, the factors in it that are favorable to the development of a free society, and the factors that it must rid itself of in order to overcome its present crisis.

A new course in "Progress and Poverty" opened the week of October 28, with good attendance. Another course opens the week of January 27, 1941, and a campaign is already under way to secure many students. One of the methods being used is the urging of every friend and graduate to secure one student for the School.

The extension courses continue to build up. Particularly remarkable is the progress of the Boston and the New Jersey extensions. The latter has already secured a headquarters at Newark. Chicago continues its sustained activity, and its Speakers Bureau is taking the Windy City by storm.

The School of Democracy

Within the very short time it has been in existence, the School of Democracy has already shown signs of growth and progress. Classes are held at headquarters (1165 Broadway, New York, in the office of the Manhattan Single Tax Club), and there are extension classes at Bellerose and Brighton Beach. In addition, questions and answers for a correspondence course have been worked out. The text-book used in the courses is "The Economic Democracy," by Horace J. Haase, who is teaching the classes. Mr. Haase is ably assisted by Cecil C. Tucker, who is serving as Executive Secretary of the School.

A Library has been established. It has been greatly augmented by a contribution of three hundred pieces of literature from Mrs. Amalia Du Bois, consisting of books, pamphlets and back files of LAND AND FREEDOM. The Library also arranges to lend the text-book to students at ten cents a week. If the student wishes to purchase the book later, whatever rental he paid will be deducted from the price.

Manhattan Single Tax Club

In furtherance of the plan of extending the activity of this Club in its new quarters, one meeting a week is being held—Mondays from 8:30 to 10:30 P. M. Remember the address—1165 Broadway, New York City; entrance at 25 West 27th Street; one flight up.

Following is a list of lecture and debate subjects, and speakers, for the ensuing eight weeks:

Dec. 9—"Organization, Local and National," Lecture by President Ingersoll. "Is 'Single Tax' a Good Name for Our Movement?" Debate.

Dec. 16—"Coordination of Organization and Teaching," Lecture by Harry Haase. "Should Politics as Well as Economics Be Taught?" Debate.

Dec. 23—"How Can We Spread M. S. T. C. Activities?" Lecture by Grace Isabel Colbron. "Step-by-Step Versus All-at-Once," Debate.

Dec. 30—"What State Movements Are Best?" Lecture by Alfred N. Chandler. "What Progress Have Political Movements Made?" Debate.

Jan. 6—"How Can National Organizations Serve the Henry George School?" Lecture by Nathan Hillman. "How Many Kinds of Rent are There?" Debate.

Jan. 13—"Do We Waste Time on Interest, the Wage Fund, and Malthus?" Lecture by Cecil C. Tucker. "Does Rent Enter Into Price, or a Tax on Rent?" Debate.

Jan. 20—"Can the Money Question be Linked With the Land Question?" Lecture by President Ingersoll. "Cooperation With the New Deal, Labor Unions, etc." Debate.

Jan. 27—"What is the Ultimate Government Under Freedom?" Lecture by Harry Weinberger. "Must Government Always Rely on Force?" Debate.

The above program may be taken as a model for organization of branches of the National Single Tax Association—which is affiliated with the Club. Branches or chapters should be active in every sizeable community.

Alaska

Mr. Jim Busey continues to publish his sparkling journal. Four changes have been made recently. The name of the paper has been changed to *Alaska Frontier*; it appears in a larger format; the publication address has been changed to Valdez, Alaska; and the subscription price has been reduced to \$1.00 per year.

Good, sound Georgeist philosophy appears regularly in *Alaska Frontier*, and this is balanced by informative, newsy articles, humor, and many pithy little gems of wisdom. That Mr. Busey succeeds in making his presentation popular is evidenced by the fact that the September-October issue of *Alaska Frontier* was sold out on the news-stands.

The paper is "devoted to Alaska, to Alaska's problems and to the Freedom for which Alaska stands," and carries as a slogan on the front page: "To Open Alaska Industry, Open Alaska Lands." The articles are of such general interest, that it would be well worth while for you to subscribe to this paper, no matter where you may be. As stated above, the subscription price is \$1.00, and the address is: *Alaska Frontier*, Valdez, Alaska.

Australia

The Australian Georgeists are constant in their efforts to keep the question of land reform open in legislatures and before the public. Mr. E. J. Craigie, Member of the House of Assembly for Flinders, and President of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, takes every opportunity to uphold Georgeist principles. There was a debate in the House recently, concerning a Bill granting the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. power to fix terms for a water line supplied to the Whyalla district. The B. H. P. is already a monopoly concern, and Mr. Craigie constantly directed attention to the fact that this Bill would increase their monopolistic powers. However, the Bill was passed by a majority of seven, despite Mr. Craigie's brave fight.

Also important to our Australian friends, and part of their program, is Proportional Representation. They have had a little more success with this reform. *The People's Advocate* of October 21 reports that the Bill for the adoption of Proportional Representation in connection with the South Australian elections was advanced another stage on October 9, when the second reading was carried by 20 votes to 16. Mr. Craigie also carries on the work for P. R. in the House of Assembly.

The Henry George League of New South Wales continues its varied activities, among which is conducting the School of Social Science. In an article on the School in *The Standard*, Mr. G. H. McCredie reports: "The School is purely an educational body, and it is a most important adjunct to the Henry George League. It was formed by Messrs. W. A. Dowe and J. Brandon about three years ago, and since that time approximately 300 students have passed through it. Of this number about 10 have remained as leaders or instructors.

"It is now the work of the Henry George League, which embraces the School of Social Science, to bring the philosophy of Henry George before the people in such an attractive manner as to excite their interest sufficiently to make them desire to take a course of study of economic science."

On the program of the Henry George League is a series of weekly discussions and debates. One of these discussions, held October 28, was on Gaston Haxo's "Theory of Interest," which appeared in our July-August issue.

Denmark

Our Danish comrades are still laboring for the Cause! For some months—that is, since the German occupation of Denmark—we did not hear about Georgeist work in that little country. Recently, however, they have resumed sending us their excellent quarterly publication, *Grundskyld*, which has not been suspended. In the June and October issues of this journal, which we have just received, our Danish friends tell us of their thoughts and activities during the dark months. They have not wavered in their faith and work, and their tone is one of hope.

In the June issue, J. L. Bjorner has an article on "Our Faith and Our Power." In it he sets forth the position of Georgeists in the world today. "Is there no hope?" he asks in concluding, and answers, "Yes! We are engaged in a great work of economic enlightenment, and already many have been taught the importance of a free society. We must never cease in our work. We are the Apostles of today—the future depends on our Faith and our Power."

The June issue also carried a notice of two important bequests. One is from a prominent person, Alfred Pedersen, who has left a legacy for education in social economy. 200 Kronen a year will be given to any student recognized by the Left Wing Youth or the Henry George Foundation. The other is a gift of 25,000 Kronen received by the Henry George Foundation. The Foundation now has 40,000 Kronen, and all the money is used for non-partisan educational work.

In the October issue of *Grundskyld* appears the address of F. Folke at the grave of Abel Brink on September 2, the birthday of Henry George. On the grave-stone of Brink, at his own request, are carved the words, "*Jorden for Folket*" ("The Land for the People"). "This," said Folke, "stands up against the opposing thought, '*Jorden for de Maegtige*' ('The Land for the Mighty')."

In another article in the same issue, Mr. Folke offers some thoughts on the present situation. "The trouble today," he says, "is that the countries did not hearken to the need for true economic freedom. We, in our little country, are not free from blame. Have we preserved freedom? What we need is an awakening. We Georgeists must carry on the fight for economic freedom."

Jakob Lange has published a new work, "Socialokonomi" ("Social Economy"). It is a Georgeist book, and in it Henry George is quoted extensively. The *Okoteknisk Højskole* (which is the name given to the Danish Henry George School) has asked the author to work out a manual for the book, for the use of the students.

The *Højskole* reports favorable progress. It has been in existence for three seasons, and has already taught over 1000 students. This Fall it entered its fourth season, and is growing more and more influential.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE TIMES PRODUCE THE BOOK

"The Economic Democracy" by Horace Joseph Haase. Orlin Tremaine Company, New York. 1940. 400 pp. \$2.25.

With the advantage of, among other things, some seventy years of criticism of Henry George, Mr. Haase launches forth into a fresh elucidation of the social sciences. He directs his appeal less to the dreamers after Utopia than to a generation who, taught in the harsh school of the materialistic sciences, require of the social philosopher the same kind and degree of evidence that they demand of those who demonstrate the simplest propositions of physics and chemistry.

The pace of the book is set in the seven-page chapter on definitions. The attention of the reader is invited to the fact that "a scientific definition is a description of a phenomenon, as well as the explanation of the meaning of a term," and that "thus within any one science the question of definitions resolves itself into a question of logic." The scientific procedure consists of nothing more than observation, classification, assignment of an exclusive nomenclature, and the determination of causal relationships.

Mr. Haase does not differ from Henry George in any important conclusion. From one end to the other his book is a cold, merciless condemnation of the private collection of land values. But if nothing more could be said, it might well be asked, "Why, then, write another book?"

The purpose is exhibited in the pattern. Strongly influenced by Dove, and under the necessity of adhering to his definition of a definition, Mr. Haase rigidly excludes from each branch of the subject all phenomena that are not peculiar to it. Thus we have the science of economics, dealing with the production of wealth; the science of political economy, dealing with exchange and the phenomena to which exchange gives rise; the science of sociology, concerning the ethical relations between men in their commercial dealings; and the science of politics, "treating of the natural laws governing the regulation of man's conduct by men."

This breakdown of the subject matter yields a perspective of the entire field of the social sciences which lays the axe to a good deal of fruitless quibbling. Of more specific interest, however, is Mr. Haase's elucidation of the nature and relation of utility and value; his simplification of distribution by classing interest as the wages of the capitalist and rent as the wages of society; his identification of Individualism and true Socialism, and the consequent discarding of the latter term as superfluous and, in its present connotation, misleading; and his demonstration that while planning is obviously necessary as a prelude to action, the character of the plan determines whether its fruits will be freedom or slavery.

"The Economic Democracy" makes no pretense of competing for George's place in the hearts of men. No knowledge that can ever come to light will dim the lustre of that man's fame. Yet the temper of the times makes it advisable to divest these extremely controversial subjects of even the most fleeting suspicion of personal sponsorship and emotional bias. This is true even of the doctrines of Jesus Christ. People have been betrayed by opinion and seduced by appeal to their sympathy until at last they have turned their faces from anything but the most incontrovertible fact.

The presentation of the argument for land-value taxation in textual form is never wasted effort. The volume under consideration is filled with up-to-date material and references with which the modern student will have become familiarized through his newspaper reading. And after the process of the true democracy has been

developed step by step, the student is presented with a Platform of Freedom, containing specific application of principles to practice, and he is invited to cooperate in the movement through an existing organization with which he is made acquainted.

In addition to the original contributions mentioned above, the book is roughly a combination of "Progress and Poverty", "The Science of Political Economy", and "Democracy Versus Socialism". The style in parts is somewhat labored, in parts inspired, on the whole unemotional. In the crucible of classroom work some few defects may rise to the surface. Nevertheless, in the opinion of this writer, its method of treatment makes it superior as a teaching text to "Progress and Poverty". It has the approval of many substantial Georgeists.

CECIL CARROLL TUCKER, JR.

GEORGEIST PHYSICIAN PROBES CIVILIZATION

"When Loneliness Comes," by George A. Glenn, M. D. Published by the Author, Suite 632 Empire Building, Denver, Color. 1940. 309 pp. \$3.00.

Dr. Glenn, besides being a senator of Colorado, has his own practice in Denver, is surgeon to Physicians and Surgeons Hospital, Professor of Anatomy and Demonstrative Clinical Surgery, College of Physicians and Surgeons, and has served in many other institutions and hospitals.

Dr. Glenn has been watching the growing neurasthenia that has rapidly crept over civilization. He discusses in this all too brief book the vast conglomerated alliance between the medical profession and the pharmaceutical supply houses that preys on the physical and mental ills of mankind with pills and nostrums. He understands, too, that land monopoly has a blighting effect on the people in civilized society. "In reviewing history," he says, "we perceive that in the primitive state all land is comparatively free and afforded by the Creator for the use of men, to labor and live on. Whereas with the encroachment of organized 'civilized' people—the free land is ruthlessly seized from the native inhabitants and direct ownership claimed by the invading Government. After this aggrandizement, sabotage occurs, and all the fertile land and the water rights thereof are parceled out to governmental favorites, who promptly force the native inhabitants into slavery by demanding tribute for occupancy thereof." And he goes on to urge a proper solution of this problem.

Dr. Glenn has observed that humanity is being driven relentlessly to swift senility by the pace of civilization. He has seen women's frigidity and men's impotency become more widespread. Hormone extracts from animal life are being given to slow up the rapidly aging members of society who are being defeated before they achieve their goals or secure recognition. But Dr. Glenn is of the belief that within plant life exists hormonal substance of greater purity, economy and potency—and to either disprove this position or substantiate it he took a trip to the jungles of Brazil, where after many encounters with beast and man, he came upon the beautiful Amazonian women, and learned the secret of their longevity.

Dr. Glenn devotes the first half of his book to the conversations he had with different people who were running away from their personal civilized troubles. There was a statistician, an authoress, a junior business executive, a social worker. Each one had ramified contacts with society in his or her professional capacity; each also had personal problems. And each one was cynical of Dr. Glenn's wholesome, if enlightened, views on connubial happiness. Each one had been so conditioned by the "civilizing" influences of our strangled economy that he could not begin to see the truth and the light freely given to him by Dr. Glenn.

Those who enjoyed James Hilton's "Lost Horizon" can relive the beauty and sweetness of that land in the second half of this book—except that this is not fiction. This is the true story of longevity, of economic freedom, of social happiness.

As a reviewer who loves figures for the power of their accuracy but dreads them if not footnoted as to their source, I often felt in my reading of "When Loneliness Comes" that our author bandied his percentages a little too fluently.

I should also like to have seen more pictures to document his chapters. Assuredly, the book should now be followed up by a well-financed crew of social scientists and cameramen—both still and movie. It would be interesting to see whether philanthropy will stop pampering with its expenditures of monies to preserve the status quo, but will give funds to finance a follow-up to Dr. Glenn's trip.

It will also be interesting to learn whether the medical, sociological, anthropological, pedagogical and other professional journals will accept articles on these findings.

Dr. Glenn's book is enjoying a wide circulation in Colorado. It should be widely circulated, for, amidst the wide variety of subjects sure to arouse popular interest, the author has cleverly mingled "sex" with economics and the land question. He urges his readers to disentangle from their minds the warping effects of our neurasthenic life, and, with a fresh approach, to work toward a more ideal society.

WILLIAM W. NEWCOMB

FRAUDULENT LAND GRANTS

"Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York," by Dr. Irving Mark. Columbia University Press, New York. 1940.

Even devotees of land reform may be astonished when confronted with the extent of fraud which accompanied early land grants. In Dr. Mark's interesting study, some of these frauds are uncovered.

The looseness and vagueness with which many grants were described, by metes and bounds, permitted huge increases in the size of the tracts granted. Among the grantees was one Robert Livingston, who in 1675 was appointed Secretary of the Board of Commissioners of Indian Affairs. Livingston, like other politicians of his day, carried the favor of several Governors who assisted him in the acquisition of thousands of acres of land. One land grant patent was stretched from 2600 to over 160,000 acres. Livingston acquired this tract for 930 guilders (about \$375) in wampum, and \$200 in axes, kettles, knives, blankets and similar commodities. What the Indians could use their axes for, with their land gone, is an interesting speculation.

It was quite simple to stretch a land grant. The metes and bounds which described them would refer to "where Two Black Oake Trees are Marked wt. L," or "where Heapes of Stone Lye," or by a stream that winds its way around many bends and turns, and run back into the woods.

In this manner, the Van Rensselaers were able to acquire, in the vicinity of Albany, upwards of one million acres. The claim of Rev. Godfridius Dellius involved 537,600 acres in the Saratoga area.

Dr. Mark found that huge concentrations of land in the hands of a few were accomplished through fraud, chicanery, nepotism and political corruption. There is ample material in his work, on which he could have easily moralized, but which he chose rather to set forth as a historical episode. However, the work is commendable from that viewpoint, and is worthy of reference for those interested in the search for a cure.

J. H. N.

CORRESPONDENCE

L & F GOES ON THE AIR

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I happened to read the July-August issue of your magazine LAND AND FREEDOM. Your proposals appear to be both sound and intelligent.

Every Wednesday we present a radio program over Station WLTH at 1:30 P. M. We would be pleased to have someone on the editorial board of your magazine speak for about 15 minutes on Nov. 27th.

Kindly let me know whether it will be possible for you to accept this invitation.

Cordially yours,

FRANCIS MERCHANT

THE BIOSOPHICAL INSTITUTE

New York, N. Y.

(In response to the above kind offer of The Biosophical Institute, Mr. C. J. Smith delivered a radio talk on the subject of "Idealism and Realism," in which the Georgeist philosophy was treated from the viewpoint of practical idealism. The Biosophical Institute, of which Dr. Frederick Kettner is the Founder and President, is an organization devoted to Character and Peace Education. Its headquarters are at Broadway and 67th Street, New York City.—Ed.)

GILBERT TUCKER ON ORGANIZATION

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I should like to add a word to the recent pro and con discussion in LAND AND FREEDOM regarding organization, in which I took the affirmative side. As is often the case, when we accentuate differences, we lose sight of major points of agreement, and I am sure that Mr. Frank Chodorov and myself are far more in accord than may be apparent.

By organization Mr. Chodorov means a group united for one of two purposes: to quote his words, "to enjoy one another's company because of this common interest, or to impose on others their common interest by the strength of numbers." If such are to be the objects of an organization, let's have none of it, and I agree with him as to the futility of any such plan. But are these the purposes at which we should aim, or are they the purposes of organizations somewhat comparable to those we already have? If Mr. Chodorov will read the objectives which I roughly outlined, he will, I think, be largely in agreement with me.

There are countless organizations which, in a way, parallel the goal at which we should aim, all devoid of the objectives to which Mr. Chodorov rightly objects. Consider many of the professional associations of physicians, lawyers, architects, nurses, educators and the like, or more commercially-minded groups like Chambers of Commerce, trade associations and kindred organizations. Or study innumerable organizations working for mere correlation, avoidance of over-lapping and general efficiency including the great problem of financing—charity organization societies, community chests and the like. True, they sometimes do have good times together and sometimes they unwisely yield to the temptation to indulge in ill-judged political action, but all this is apart from their major purposes, and indeed organization might be very useful to us in holding in check some untimely and half-baked political campaigns. As for some lighter activities, there can be little objection, if not overdone; need we always go about all our serious purposes devoid of all sense of comradeship or of pure fun? Even the Henry George School has its occasional dinners and jollifications—and what harm do they do, as long as they are mere side-

shows while serious business goes on uninterrupted in the big tent. Perhaps sometimes, if practised with moderation, as should be all amusements, the greater purpose is even furthered by such affairs as long as they remain wholly incidental.

In the same issue of LAND AND FREEDOM which carried the recent discussion, I note that many recognize the imperative need of association. Almost uniformly, these writers see, as does Mr. Chodorov, that the imperative need is education, although they may not always interpret that word in a way confined only to formal study in the class-room. Mr. Chodorov wisely states the educational objective of the School, devoted to and chartered for that specific purpose, but why limit the stimulation of the countless avenues of service, which he mentions, to work for and under the School? "An educational institution must be devoid of any political effort" and in that I would agree; I would even go further, for I am not at all sure that "to bombard editors with letters" is a proper function of a School, although training in such procedure is entirely proper. The graduates as well as many others must be encouraged to engage in many lines of work, which are almost wholly educational in the broadest sense but which nevertheless do not fall directly within the province of a chartered school.

Perhaps the greatest objectives of such an enterprise as I urge, should be correlation and financing. It should aid and encourage many activities, again generally educational, outside of the province of the class-room, and it should be the great central organ for financing our work as a whole but without the slightest interference with operations conducted by groups of a specialized or local nature. That many opportunities are lost for securing considerable sums for the promotion of our great task—is a matter of positive knowledge, and the explanation lies in the simple fact that we have no strong and stable association which represents the rank and file of Georgeists and is not limited, either positively or by policy and custom, to a specific activity.

Certainly, multiplicity of national organizations is not to be desired. Should any spirit of enterprise or cooperation be evinced, there are two existing bodies which might well be developed to fill a larger field—the Robert Schalkenbach and the Henry George Foundations. Both have weaknesses which must be eliminated before either can take the place which it might assume. The Schalkenbach Foundation has no broad membership but is only a well administered trusteeship for handling certain funds. It is made up of busy men who can afford but little time for its affairs and it commands no general support from Georgeists. The Henry George Foundation, to put it bluntly, does little but promote an annual conference and hold title to George's birth-place. If either or both of these organizations would undergo a renaissance and attract real support from the many Georgeists, today so often dormant, there would be limitless possibilities ahead. Of the two, the Schalkenbach is the most hopeful and my suggestion is that some policy be developed for building up a membership—call them members, associates, friends or what you will—to which could be delegated some measure of responsibility for aiding its work, broadening its field and for raising funds. Every effort should be made to avoid its domination by cranks and extremists or by those within our ranks who are intolerant of every endeavor not in line with their single-track minds.

The functions of these members or associates might be only advisory and contributory but it would seem that there could be no objection to their representation on the board, for one may question whether a close corporation device, with a self-perpetuating board, is the best when a large and general support is sought. With energy and wisdom, and particularly with tact and tolerance, a

strong organization could in time be developed, strengthening the Schalkenbach Foundation, enabling it to expand and develop.

The new association would be but little different from the foundations of today except in stability, vigor, more general appeal and in the possibility which it would offer to secure better co-operation and more adequate financing for our great task. What possible objection can there be to such a program?

Albany, N. Y.

GILBERT M. TUCKER

With all respect for Mr. Tucker's views as above expressed, we believe the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation is doing a splendid work, and should continue to function in its present special field.

ED.

AN AUSTRALIAN VIEW ON INTEREST

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your July-August issue contains an interesting article on a "Theory of Interest" by Mr. Gaston Haxo. He is sound in his statements that interest is not due to the reproductive forces of nature; also, that the contract (interest) freely entered into by borrower and lender, both of whom benefit therefrom, is equitable; and this custom is not likely to cease. Payment for service rendered, and it is commonly so understood, is the justification for interest, and the average rate is determined by competition between lenders. The return to lenders is their own concern.

I purchase a machine (capital). I purchase it from my own funds. It is mine for all time. That is just. But again, I borrow money not for itself, but for the service it supplies and I buy the machine. It is not mine. I pay for its hire. That is just. Service for service—interest.

Surely Mr. Haxo's statement that interest as an institution is "but the evil fruit of an evil economic system", and is "unearned increment" is wrong. It largely arises from his treating money as if it purchased only capital. If I, a land speculator, buy and sell vacant lots I do not spend money in purchasing capital. I purchase land—a wide distinction. If I buy a block, erect a building upon it, and let the whole, I am paid in money; I receive so much in interest on my building (capital). *This is just.* And I receive so much in land rent. This is due to society, and I have no just claim to it. Mr. Haxo makes no such vital distinction.

There is little doubt the enormous land rent incomes of Astors, English dukes, German junkers, etc. are invested by them partly in purchasing additional land—not capital. They also invest land-rent money in capitalistic enterprises, claiming "interest" and also in interest-bearing Government loans, stealthily reducing the masses to slavery. The whole world is the sufferer.

The investment origin is land rent privately appropriated. Only in this sense is Mr. Haxo's statement correct that "interest as an institution has its roots in land monopoly and the resultant exploitation of labor". This investment of the people's values we must put an end to. We must eliminate all land rent from private incomes.

Then will money lent be invested in capital alone, which, with interest thereon, Mr. Haxo endorses as just. Long-term interest on debts would disappear and back debts be paid off, for a new world of prosperity would prevail. The effect of breaking up land rent monopoly would be the same as witnessed in early "Go West" days before land speculation got the mastery and brought the United States to its present condition of progress and poverty. George would be vindicated. So great would be the demand for labor and capital, that wages and interest (both just, and the same in origin) would rise together, and with land rent collected and the abolition of monopolies, parasitism would be ended.

Melbourne, Australia.

F. T. HODGKISS

"CORRECCION"

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. Joseph Sinnott, in his article "The Land Problem in Mexico," displays a remarkable knowledge of this country and the rapid development of its national economic life in the course of one century. I should like, however, to correct a few errors in the article.

In the first place, the name Anahuac which he applies to one of the strong tribes in pre-Columbian times is wrong. Anahuac was the name of the luxuriant valley on which the City of Mexico is situated; it means "near the water," in reference to its many lakes. The tribe he mentions was named Nahuatl. This really was a generic name including several of the best cultured tribes, and it means "one who speaks well."

The labor movement under Lombardo Toledano which Mr. Sinnott refers to favorably, has been only a political trick to give power to a group of workingmen's leaders leaning strongly to Bolshevism. Toledano himself and President Cardenas seem to believe in the efficacy of Communism and have fanatically worked for its spread. As often happens, the new Frankenstein has become too strong for them, and they no longer know how to wield it. Fortunately there is a large amount of common sense among the common people, and workingmen have begun to see the uselessness of Marx's theory.

I, too, have regretted that our presidents "do not know the way." But we should not wonder; in Cardenas' cabinet figure men who are professed Georgeists. Why have they done nothing toward the subdivision of large estates by means of the fiscal weapon, as Henry George advises? The other way brings a neat sum into the private pockets of functionaries. The temptation is too great. Then, what use would a copy of "Progress and Poverty" be in the hands of Mexico's leaders? They won't read it. I wonder whether the leaders of the United States have ever studied it.

Monterrey, Mexico

PROF. E. T. WESTRUP

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

We are very pleased with the spirit manifested in your editorials. They remind us of Louis F. Post's *The Public*. While always forceful, Post was never bitter or rancorous.

Pasadena, Calif.

MR. AND MRS. FRANK H. BODE

(Continued from page 183)

which men might claim title. Security of individual liberty, attested by citizenship, and encompassing freedom to enjoy all other social and government services, is another, and paramount, service for which Rent is compensation.

Were these truths understood and recognized by all—what man, or group of men, would have the face or un-wisdom to precipitate a war, to preserve to themselves the privilege of ignoring their obligations to society, the payment of Rent in full to the government? By unitedly promulgating the truth that men must toil to possess the "increments" of nature, might not Georgeists again start mankind on the march towards the goal of Henry George—the public collection of the Rent and the abolition of Taxation? Might not such a program remove obstacles to the solution of the land problem, and disclose the insanity and futility of war? Would they deny this to have been his goal?