

January-February 1941

Land and Freedom

An International Journal of the Henry George Movement Founded in 1901

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY NUMBER

Four Decades of the Struggle for Freedom

War and Post-War Reconstruction in
Great Britain—Canada—France—Denmark

The Land Tax Fight in Oklahoma

Tom W. Cheek, President Oklahoma Farmers' Union

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT

Section 2: A Legislative Framework
for the Philosophy of 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.

January-February 1941

Vol. XLI, No. 1

WHOLE No. 224

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: Ing. Pavlos Giannelia

INDEX TO CONTENTS

COMMENT AND REFLECTION	3
FORTY YEARS OF THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM ..	4
THE LAND TAX FIGHT IN OKLAHOMA—Tom W. Cheek	15
THE CRITICS CRITICIZED—Jacob Schwartzman	17
NOTICE OF INDEX TO LAND AND FREEDOM FOR 1940	18
RECONSTRUCTION IN GREAT BRITAIN Douglas J. J. Owen	19
CANADA'S WARTIME ECONOMY—Herbert T. Owens..	21
FRANCE RETURNS TO THE SOIL—Pavlos Giannelia	23
IS IT TWILIGHT OR DAWN?—J. L. Bjorner	24
SIGNS OF PROGRESS	26
THE INTEREST QUESTION—A. G. Huie	30
BOOK REVIEWS	32
CORRESPONDENCE	33
THE PHILOSOPHY OF FREEDOM	35

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 theoretical contribution of this great American thinker."—JOHN DEWEY.

Land and Freedom

Vol. XLI

JANUARY — FEBRUARY, 1941

No. 1

Comment and Reflection

IT may be that there is a widespread awakening to the importance of a reserve of free land to the prosperity of our country; that the vanishing of our frontiers is the cause of many of our present woes, including unemployment, low wages and depressions. It may even be that the influence of Henry George's teachings on this subject is permeating the American mind. At any rate, Mr. W. J. Cameron saw fit to speak out against this seeming tide of opinion in a recent talk on the Ford Sunday Evening Hour, broadcast over a nation-wide network, on the subject of "Frontiers."

IN the course of his talk, Mr. Cameron said: "To hear some people complain that there are no more frontiers, one might gain the impression that frontiers were made of frosted cake and candy. One might think also that we are a nation of frustrated frontiersmen imprisoned—suffocated—within these paltry three million square miles that comprise continental United States . . . The answer is that *no* frontiers have vanished—that every sort of frontier that ever was is still here. But to find a frontier one must first be a frontiersman. Several points are conveniently forgotten when we talk about frontiers. The first is that there is nothing very comfortable or inviting about them . . . They make men pay as the price of 'to have and to hold,' their sweat and blood . . . Is this the frontier whose passing you bewail? Then please be comforted; you can find it almost anywhere in the United States today. Any day you choose you can exchange the hardships of civilization for this. The United States is not settled yet . . . A population map of the United States will show you that ours is the most sparsely populated of all the great nations . . . 'But,' they say, 'there's no more *free land*.' *There never was any free land*. Frontiers are never *easy* and they are never *free*. The first man on the spot pays the highest price even if he does not pay a dollar . . . There is living room here that never was used, vast unoccupied empires waiting . . . The fact is, the price of pioneering is too high for most of us to pay . . ."

THERE are several points in Mr. Cameron's dissertation with which we can agree. It is true that "every sort of frontier that ever was is still here." It is true that the price of pioneering is "sweat and blood." It is true that the United States is sparsely populated. It is true that there are "vast unoccupied empires waiting." And finally, but in a different sense from Mr. Cameron's, it is true that "the price of pioneering is too high for most of us to pay."

HAVING yielded to Mr. Cameron on the foregoing, perhaps it would not be amiss for us to ask a few questions:—Why is it that shipload after shipload of pioneers came to America centuries ago, knowing that they would not find "frosted cake and candy"? Why do not a great number of pioneers come from Europe today? Do they prefer the conditions with which they are now faced to the hard life of the frontiers? Are they not willing to pay the price of "sweat and blood" in order to live in peace and freedom? If they are willing to come (and God knows they are!), why do we erect immigration barriers, when there are so many frontiers to cultivate? What about our own millions of unemployed—descendants of pioneers; are they too lazy to work on the millions and millions of acres of fertile land now out of use? Do they prefer the comfort of the park bench and the municipal lodging house? Should not our Government give public notice that there are "vast unoccupied empires waiting"? Would no one respond? Why was there such a desperate rush when the Government gave out similar notices in the nineteenth century?

ARE the migrant workers samples of people who prefer the comforts of civilization to the hardships of the frontier? Are they not modern pioneers seeking new frontiers? Why do they not find them, when they exist everywhere? When the "bootleg" coal miners went to work on a large company's deserted mine, were they not pioneering? Does Mr. Cameron recall their fate? Does he know that there are vast empires comprising millions of fertile acres in our middle West, through which one can drive all day without seeing a man at labor, and that a landless wretch would receive treatment as a criminal were he to attempt to cultivate them on his own initiative? Is it barely possible that the barb-wire fence surrounding these empires is keeping off our modern pioneers? Can it be that extortionate rents are the present-day "price of pioneering"?

IN declaring that "there never was any free land," Mr. Cameron displays a naivete not in keeping with the seriousness of his subject. Can he possibly harbor a definition of "free" land as a place where men's requirements would produce themselves without human exertion? Not even the lowliest schoolboy could, for long, entertain the thought of such a paradise on earth. For the benefit of Mr. Cameron, may we remind him that from the very beginning men have never asked for an earth free of the natural obstacles imposed in His infinite wisdom by the Creator—what they have cried out against are the unnatural obstacles which have been wrought by Man himself.

Forty Years of the Struggle for Freedom

As Viewed in the Pages of Land and Freedom

1901! A new century—the amazing Twentieth Century. The United States was rapidly becoming a great world power, with possessions overseas, and unprecedented industrial expansions. The McKinley administration had ushered in a period of that sort of “prosperity” against which Henry George had warned. Monopolies and trusts were in the ascendant. The shadows of Standard Oil and United States Steel dominated the national scene.

Throughout the world there was ferment and unrest. In Europe, Asia, everywhere, old forms were crumbling. The people were awakening. Equality was struggling against inequality.

In the midst of these world affairs, a new social reform was striving valiantly to bring its message to a long suffering humanity. It was the movement to which Henry George gave memorable impetus—the struggle for freedom—free land, free trade, free men. This trinity was entering a new phase in the evening of the Gilded Age. Its foremost apostle had passed away only a few years before, and now it was confronted with a critical test of survival. The brave workers in the cause faced the turn of the century with an enthusiasm unabated and with a conviction unshaken.

The Founding of the Review

Among the leaders of the Henry George movement who were carrying on the struggle in various ways—political, propagandistic, educational—was Joseph Dana Miller. A figure already respected in the literary world, Miller chose to enlist as a full-time worker in the Georgeist cause rather than merely bask in the more comfortable fame of belles lettres.

Miller came to see the need of unity in the movement—or something that would rally together the many workers in all the diverse fields of endeavor, and demonstrate to themselves, as well as to the world, that they were severally engaged in the same noble task—of establishing the reign of natural law in the economic world.

With this in mind Joseph Dana Miller founded in 1901 the journal which now bears the name of LAND AND FREEDOM. It was originally styled the SINGLE TAX REVIEW. (The Georgeist reform in those days was commonly known as the “single tax”.) The REVIEW commenced as a quarterly. Vol. 1, No. 1 appeared in the Summer of 1901. The subtitle of the magazine was “A Record of the Progress of Single Tax and Tax Reform Throughout the World.” In his Publisher’s Notes, Miller wrote: “We believe the REVIEW will demonstrate its reason for being; that it is the

best propaganda medium now published, and that it is worthy of general support.”

The contents of Vol. 1, No. 1 were fairly indicative of the field the REVIEW was to cover for the years to come. Among the items were the following: The story of Tom L. Johnson’s brave fight for municipal reform and single tax as the newly-elected mayor of Cleveland; an account, by Lawson Purdy, of a Conference on Taxation held at Buffalo, composed of delegates appointed by the Governors of the States; an obituary, by Henry George, Jr., of James A. Herne, the famous playwright and actor, and author of the highly successful play, “Shore Acres,” which incorporated Georgeist principles; a hitherto unpublished letter from Leo Tolstoy, in which the great Russian writer said: “Henry George composed a multiplication table—clear, universally comprehensible, irrefutable. He has done his work. Let those who can put it in practice do their part. One thing is certain; as those who desire to make calculations cannot avoid the multiplication table so also those who desire to organize the social life of mankind on juster foundations will not be able to avoid Henry George’s plan, and will take it as their basis.” There were also reports of the activities of Georgeists throughout the country, state by state, and throughout the world, country by country.

Here at last was a medium for the Henry George movement throughout the world. As such a medium, the REVIEW was to keep a universal record of the progress of the single tax everywhere—progressive legislation, the activities of Georgeists, interpretations of significant current events, explanations of the philosophy for newcomers, theoretical and controversial discussions, recommendations for the conduct of Georgeist activities and for the advance of the movement.

The Status of the Movement

There was optimism in the ranks of Georgeists in those early days—optimism and determined effort. They saw their ideas spreading, many great men espousing the cause, advancing legislation throughout the world. It seemed that success was in sight. Hamlin Russell wrote in the REVIEW in 1902: “We have the right; more than that, it is our bounden duty to claim victory, full and complete.” From Denmark, Sophus Berthelson wrote: “We can plainly mark a growing comprehension among all classes of society, of the great social importance of our doctrines.” In 1905 Louis F. Post testified that the movement was making great strides. He acclaimed the present “progress in the minds and hearts of the masses of the people” as compared with

the more "ebullient times of George and McGlynn" when the masses were more astounded than understanding.

In New York, Lawson Purdy was carrying on the fight to separate the assessment of land from improvements, and rode to victory. In Chicago, a newly formed Single Tax Party was thrice put on the ballot and doubled its votes successively. In Colorado, Senator Bucklin was campaigning for the "Australasian Tax System." In the United States Congress, Robert Baker was staunchly speaking for tax reform. In Ohio, Tom L. Johnson was carrying his struggle against special privilege.

In China Dr. W. E. Macklin, missionary, was collaborating with Dr. Sun Yat Sen in translating Georgeist literature into Chinese for spreading the doctrines in that country. In Switzerland Oscar Schar reported that the land monopolists "found us more dangerous even than the Social Democrats, who looked towards an indefinite future for their hopes whereas our reform could have been easily and instantaneously put into practice." Danish Georgeists were increasing their strength in Parliament, and a new Danish Henry George League was spreading its influence. In Russia, Tolstoy was observing the general unrest, and urging Single Tax as the only measure that would save that country from revolution.

England gave encouraging signs of progress. John Paul reported that many English leaders, such as Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Winston Churchill, Lord Asquith and others, were declaring themselves in favor of land value taxation. "Our question is at the very door of Parliament here," wrote Paul, "We have a knowledge of the political situation, know the constituencies, what can be done and what ought to be done." In Australia and New Zealand, tax reform was under way. Many municipalities in both countries provided for the exemption of improvements and a higher rate on land values.

To the nucleus of leaders in the Henry George movement, however, it was clear that there were numerous thorny roads ahead, much heart-breaking toil, and many disappointments to be suffered. Constantly in the SINGLE TAX REVIEW appeared "the clarions of the battle"—admonitions to Georgeists to pull together for the great work, plans and recommendations for the future of the movement. Naturally there were disagreements as to the best course to take, and unfortunately there were splits. There were those who advocated working with the major political parties; and there were those who advocated independent political action. There were leaders who asserted that the reform must be presented as a practical fiscal reform; and there were others who insisted on presenting the philosophy in its full strength. Some advocated cooperating with liberals and radicals and socialists; others opposed this, and insisted that socialists must be openly condemned.

The pages of the REVIEW were open to all these different ideas. Miller stood for free and open discussion on all questions. He was a true democrat. But he hoped that sufficient agreement would come out of them to unite all Single Taxers into one great organization.

The advocates of cooperation with the major parties chose the Democratic label. J. B. Vining reported in 1903 that "the Single Taxers of Ohio have gone on, step by step, until today the entire Democratic organization is thoroughly permeated with their influence."

Edward T. Weeks, who proposed independent political action, asked these questions: "1st - Where Single Taxers are free to organize politically, can they vote with parties which favor the ownership of land, without themselves incurring moral guilt? 2nd - Should our political work be governed by moral principle or by mere seeming expediency?" There was a storm over these questions, and the majority of Single Taxers appeared to be in favor of independent political action. However, nothing substantial was done for some time.

There were other views. "The Single Tax at present," wrote Jane Dearborn Mills, "is an educational work. How to make our organizations strong for the educating of the world is the vital question, until we can put the system into practical exercise."

There was a flood of different proposals, and a great number of organizations. A summer resort on single tax lines was conceived. A single tax colony near a great metropolis was suggested. A Single Tax Information Bureau was started in 1903. It printed and distributed 60,000 pieces of literature. There was a Henry George Class of Economics in 1906. There were many lecture bureaus. And such orators as John Z. White, James Morton, and Frederick Monroe toured the country on speaking engagements.

One of the important organizations was the Massachusetts Single Tax League, under the direction of Charles B. Fillebrown. In 1902 the League gave a banquet to college professors and economists for the purpose of bringing them together to agree or disagree on certain phases of Georgeist doctrines. Among the points submitted to the professors were the following: A tax upon ground rent cannot be shifted; the selling value of land is reduced by the tax that is paid upon it; ground rent is what land is worth for use. Most were recorded in the affirmative. Among the professors were T. N. Carver, E. R. A. Seligman, C. J. Bullock and G. S. Callender.

Every so often in the REVIEW would appear a summation of the progress and status of the movement. Miller was convinced the reform was making headway. His chief recommendation was that there be a national organization and fuller cooperation among all the workers in various fields.

Controversies

In 1904 Louis F. Post said: "The SINGLE TAX REVIEW is coming rapidly to justify its mission as the organ of the movement whose name it has adopted. It collects with considerable fullness the news of the movement as an organ should, and is as interesting as well, which organs sometimes fail to be."

Among the many factors that made the REVIEW interesting were the various doctrinal controversies, often exciting, that appeared therein. It was quite natural that the Georgeists who had a "bone to pick" should turn to columns of the REVIEW as their mouthpiece. From the earliest days, there were perennial discussions on the interest question, single tax and socialism, public ownership versus taxation, and more obscure doctrinal points.

The earliest controversy in the REVIEW on the interest question took place in 1904. It started with a criticism of Henry George's theory of interest by Joseph Faigy, a young New Orleans Georgeist. Mr. Faigy claimed that "interest exists on account of the opportunity of investing capital in land," and that it would disappear in a free social order. This article brought such an avalanche of replies, both in agreement and disagreement, that Miller was obliged to devote a large part of a subsequent issue to a symposium on the question. Among the contributors to this discussion were such prominent writers as Lewis H. Berens, Michael Flurschein, Byron Holt, James Love, and Dr. S. Solis-Cohen.

In an editorial preface to the symposium, Miller disposed of the interest question in these syllogistic terms: "Interest is either natural, or it is not. If it is not, it will disappear under the reign of natural law which the Single Tax will inaugurate. But if it is natural, then it will persist, and its persistence will wrong no one." In the rule of economic freedom all laws are beneficent."

Another controversy that raged in the pages of the REVIEW was concerned with the Fairhope colony. Fairhope operated in some measure on single tax principles. An article appeared in the REVIEW criticizing Fairhope as a "semi-socialistic" scheme. Feeling ran high on this indictment, and the question was debated: Is Fairhope representative of Single Tax? Miller, as usual, allowed all sides to have their say, and he was criticized severely for this policy. Partisans of Fairhope ceased to give the REVIEW their support. Of one of these, Mr. Miller wrote: "We are sorry to lose Mr. as a subscriber, but if the price of his remaining on the list of our friends is suppression and silence we must perforce part with him, not, however, without regret that so good a friend of the cause should take this view of the matter." And again: "Both sides shall be heard until this unhappy controversy is disposed of."

Another article that evoked a storm was Peter Aitken's "The Chief Obstacle to the Single Tax and How to Remove It". As a matter of abstract principle, said Mr. Aitken landowners are not entitled to compensation, but as a practical matter, the question of compensation should be considered. The volume of replies required space in the REVIEW for another symposium.

There were many similar questions freely and openly discussed in the SINGLE TAX REVIEW. No debatable subject went without a flood of replies. Mr. Miller allowed all to have a voice. The REVIEW was proving itself an indispensable mouthpiece of the movement.

Conferences, Organizations, Politics

In 1908 a National Single Tax Conference was held, at which a nation-wide organization was founded. It was the American Single Tax League, and Bolton Hall was elected president. The REVIEW was adopted as the official medium of the League. (At this time the editor found it propitious to change the REVIEW from a quarterly to a bi-monthly. Its frequency has since remained unchanged; to this day it is a bi-monthly.) The League secured its own headquarters, and engaged in propaganda work—and there it seems to have petered out.

There was an important series of conferences sponsored by the Joseph Fels Commission. The leaders of this Commission were Joseph Fels himself, Frederic C. Howe, Lincoln Steffens, Bolton Hall and Daniel Kiefer. At a conference in 1910, the Commission decided to devote its resources to political action. A plan for a land tax campaign in Oregon was worked out, with Hon. W. S. U'Ren as the leader. The campaign was conducted with determination and it alarmed the entrenched interests to such an extent that they formed anti-single tax leagues, and with the help of a controlled press launched a desperate counter-drive. The Single Tax measures were defeated, but Georgeists encouraged by the near-success of their efforts, engaged in other campaigns. A Single Tax Bill was introduced in New York State. California had land-value-tax legislative proposals. A Land Value Tax Party was formed.

In England, Georgeists were fervent over the famous budget debates of 1909-1910 in Parliament. Winston Churchill and Lloyd George presented a bill for the taxation of land values. The House of Lords fought furiously and finally defeated it. In 1910 the Danish peasants rose and organized, and demanded uncompromisingly "Equal rights for all, the taxation of land values, complete free trade and special privileges for none."

The Joseph Fels Conference of 1914, reported in the REVIEW, gave evidence of progress along political lines. The city of Everett, in Washington, voted for a single tax amendment but its validity was questioned in the court.

There was a campaign in Pueblo, Colorado, led by George J. Knapp, taking advantage of the home rule amendment, to secure tax-exemption of improvements. There were campaigns in Oregon, Missouri and California. Henry George, Jr., newly elected Congressman from New York, told of the movement in the District of Columbia to secure 100% valuation of land and to extend the number and power of assessors. The nation's capital was particularly a hot-bed of land speculation.

Special Numbers

During the years 1911 - 1913, Mr. Miller published several "Special Numbers" of the REVIEW, devoted to Georgeist reform in different countries.

The issue for May-June 1911 was a "Vancouver Special Number." Vancouver, in British Columbia, Canada, was proclaimed to be "the first Single Tax city in the world." L. D. Taylor, Mayor of Vancouver, wrote on the results of the Single Tax in his city, and pointed out the stimulating effects due to removal of taxes on buildings and industry.

The September-October 1911 issue was an "Edmonton and Grain Growers Number." The city of Edmonton in Alberta, Canada, was praised as the "freest city in America." In a feature article by Wm. Short, ex-mayor of Edmonton, the application of the Single Tax in Edmonton was discussed. The Grain Growers of Canada were also featured. The Farmers' Association of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, declared themselves strongly in favor of land value taxation.

The March-April 1912 issue was a "Special Number for Germany." It featured the work of Adolf Damaschke, head of the German Bodenreform League. Poultney Bigelow, a close friend of Kaiser Wilhelm, praised the Kaiser as an advanced socialist who had studied "Progress and Poverty," and initiated a measure of Single Tax principle in the German province of Kiao-Chow in China. Many noted German professors wrote for this special number, on various phases of the land question in Germany. Among them: Dr. Karl Tolenske on "Land Tax or Nationalization of Mortgages", which latter course the Doctor advocated for Germany's particular case; Dr. Adolf Wagner on "Economic Science and the Unearned Increment Tax"; Dr. F. Schar on "The Nationalization of Water Power"; and Dr. W. Schrameier on the status of the land reform movement in the Empire.

The September-October 1912 issue appeared as a "New Zealand Special Number." It gave a full and detailed account of the history and progress toward Single Tax in legislation, how the people gained control of the legislature, and the status of the Henry George movement in that country. In New Zealand the United Labor Party was the political force which was most instrumental in securing the Single Tax advances.

The issue for January-February 1913 was a "Great Britain Special Number." It presented the story of the famous budget fights in Parliament, the movement for municipal land value taxation, and the Georgeist movement in England and Scotland. The Members of Parliament at that time who stood for land value taxation (known as "the land values group") were Francis Neilson, Josiah Wedgwood, Alexander Ure, R. L. Outhwaite, Peter W. Raffan, E. G. Hemmerde, Henry George Chancellor and James Dundas White. (Today the land values bloc comprises fifty M. P.'s.)

The November-December 1913 issue came out as a "New York City Special Number." It included a long and fascinating article "The Romance of New York Real Estate," by Joseph Dana Miller; it was a history of the land deals and the rise of land values in New York. Frederic C. Leubuscher wrote for this issue the exciting story of Henry George's mayoralty campaign of 1886. The interesting history of the Manhattan Single Tax Club was also presented; and biographies of the many Georgeist workers in New York appeared.

Many extra thousands of these special numbers were printed for wide distribution. They were indeed impressive documents and must have done much to spread Single Tax influence.

The War Years: 1914-1918

The world conflict which opened in 1914 was indeed the most disastrous the world had ever witnessed. Yet it did not enter the daily lives of people to the extent that the present struggle does. And it does not seem to have interfered seriously with Georgeist activities, though there was some abatement. In the January-February 1915 issue of the REVIEW appeared a list of Single Tax organizations and periodicals, which covered two pages. Toward the end of 1918, greater organizations and more daring projects were conceived than were ever before attempted.

As to the war itself, Miller took an editorial stand, from the beginning of the conflict, in behalf of the Allies. He was not deceived by the high-sounding phrases of the propagandists, and he indeed saw that the matter required an economic solution; but he saw Germany as an aggressor nation committing immoral acts, and he saw the war as a struggle—basically, though vaguely—between despotism and democracy.

In 1914 a New York State Single Tax League was formed, which held a Conference at Buffalo (reported in the September-October 1914 REVIEW). This Conference was notable in that there were outstanding recommendations offered for the conduct of the movement. Mary Boise Ely proposed working among college students, since their minds were as yet open and untrammelled. Prof. Lewis H. Clark

suggested a compact organization, patterned after political organizations, but devoted to educational work. The organization, he said, should be democratically run, with a constitution, committees and chairmen.

At this Conference, Oscar H. Geiger also spoke, proposing an educational program in the form of "reading circles." This is the earliest record of Geiger's utterance on the subject, and it is remarkable in its completeness. "Fundamental social betterment," said Geiger, "to be lasting, must come in response to a demand from the people, and the people must understand before they can demand . . . It is proper for us to try to get whatever measure of justice we can by such legal enactments as with the present state of the public mind we are able to obtain, but we must not delude ourselves into believing that *merely* direct effort toward legislation in the people's present state of mind will secure fundamental justice . . . This accepted, there remains only the selection of effective methods of educating the people. There are many ways, most are expensive, while many are fraught with the requirement of undue effort, and therefore wasted energy."

The method he offered was that of study groups. The whole educational program, as later exemplified in the Henry George School of Social Science that he was to found, was worked out fully. The idea aroused much interest, and was followed up with action. Reading circles were organized throughout New York State. However, the project did not continue to flourish.

1916 was the year of the first Great Adventure in California. This was a campaign to secure a Single Tax amendment in that state. Luke North was the leader; he and his fellow-workers conducted a whirlwind campaign. But, as usual, the opposition countered with all its resources—and the amendment was killed. There was another Great Adventure in 1918, which was also defeated. Luke North died shortly after.

A Conference was held at Niagara in 1916, at which an independent Single Tax political party was proposed. We can imagine the heat with which the proposal was discussed from what Miller wrote: "We may regret that the policy of independent party action had not been discussed in a calmer frame and a more philosophic mood. There are reasons for a party and there are reasons against it that were not heard by the Conference at all." At any rate, it would appear that the idea of a political party was germinating.

In November 1916, the fourth Conference of the New York State Single Tax League was held, at the University of Syracuse. It was the first time a Single Tax Conference was held within University walls. The economics course at the University of Syracuse was notable in that the four

or five hundred students of that subject devoted six weeks to the study of Henry George.

The SINGLE TAX REVIEW changed its format in 1918, to the present one. Mr. Miller submitted to his readers the question whether the magazine should also be converted into a monthly—but the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of keeping it a bi-monthly. In his editorial notes on the new appearance of the journal, he wrote: "The REVIEW, now, as in the past, will give the tax reform features of the movement . . . But the goal set out for the Single Tax shall be the goal constantly before our readers—*To Free Natural Opportunities and Industrial Enterprise from all Tribute* . . . The REVIEW will give its undeviating support to the Single Tax Party movement, and will encourage the formation of Party Organizations in every State, for a test of its principles at the polls. We have witnessed the utter collapse of all forms of Single Tax organization. For educational as well as political purposes Party Organization gives the fullest promise of cohesion and progress. The REVIEW will therefore endeavor to enlist the now hesitant body of our believers into an Army for Political Action."

Thus the REVIEW gave notice to the world on two points—it stood for the Georgeist philosophy in all its strength, and not in any diluted form; and it stood for a determined united effort on the part of all believers to lead the Georgeist reform to success.

Independent Party Action

The independent political action movement was taken up enthusiastically by a great number of Georgeists. There were many, however, who were indifferent, and others who even opposed the idea; but enough were in favor of it to form successful party organizations in many States. By the end of 1918, the Single Tax Party had organizations in half the States of the Union.

This Party movement was an outstanding milestone in the progress of our reform. It marked the close of an era of attempting to work with the major political parties, particularly the Democratic. There had been nothing but disappointment in that policy. Miller called it "one phase of Single Taxers' activities for two or three decades, a phase now demonstrably a failure and approaching an inglorious close." Henceforth the Georgeist movement was to be more clearcut. It was to build up its own resources for the spreading of its philosophy and reform.

During 1918 there were various State-wide Party Campaigns. In the New York State Campaign, Joseph Dana Miller was the unanimous choice of the Party for Governor. In 1919 Miller made an impassioned plea for a united nation-wide Party campaign. He wrote: "Great God! We are the torch-bearers of an economic world-gospel! We bring balm for the healing of the nations, a message for the oppressed, a new Magna Charta of emancipation for

mankind. If rejected, Leagues of Nations, covenants of peoples, are veritable 'scraps of paper.' Again autocracy will challenge the political democracies that even now are shaken by internal revolutions. Again the Man on Horseback, a pinchbeck Hohenzollern or a real Napoleon, will over-ride the world. Again on dying democracies, by power of cannon and shot and shell a modern Tamerlane will seek to fatten." This dire and remarkable "prophecy" is reminiscent of Henry George's immortal words in "Progress and Poverty." Miller was in dead earnest.

The plea for a national campaign bore fruit. A national Convention of the Single Tax Party was held. They decided to enter the 1920 general election with a platform and candidates of their own. James Robinson was appointed National Organizer; Robert Macauley, National Chairman; and Joseph Dana Miller, National Secretary. For once Georgeists all over the country were united in a nationwide venture.

The Single Tax Party decided to hold their 1920 Convention in Chicago—the city where the Farmer-Labor Party and the Committee of Forty-Eight were also convening. This latter was a group of liberals, malcontents, and radicals of all sorts and shades, brought together from the forty-eight states (hence the name) by a wealthy man who hoped to have them agree on a single platform, acceptable to all liberals. The Single Taxers had a reason for choosing the same locale as the Committee of Forty-Eight. They proposed to attend the Forty-Eight convention, and attempt to swing it over to a pure Single Tax platform.

It was a dramatic moment when the Single Taxers entered the Forty-Eight Convention hall. There were only about fifty of them, but as they entered the hall where five hundred indeterminate "reformers" were wrangling, the Committee leaders regarded this small group with apprehension. Here was a band who knew what they wanted, and were determined.

After endless wrangling, the Single Taxers, by sheer force of fighting their way through the mob, obtained a hearing. They read their platform, which was vociferously seconded. Confusion followed, and the Single Taxers were on the point of losing their case, when in an inspiring strategy they forced the Chairman to recognize their speaker. He was Oscar Geiger. He proceeded to pour forth an impassioned and inspiring speech for the Single Tax, which brought down the house. The Single Tax platform was unanimously adopted by that great crowd. But the Committee leaders, who insisted on playing politics, sought to effect a merger between the Committee of Forty-Eight and the Farmer-Labor Party. They marched over to the latter's convention hall—and that was the last of them. They were swallowed up by the larger party—and the Single Tax platform was lost.

Disgusted by this loose game of politics, the Single Taxers went ahead with their own Party convention—adopted the platform, voted on resolutions, nominated candidates. But they had won the respect of the liberals. "You men have a sense of solidarity," said Amos Pinchot to them. The Single Tax Presidential candidate was Robert Macauley, and the candidate for Vice President was Richard C. Barnum. The Party succeeded in getting on the ballot of twenty-four states. In the national election, the Single Tax vote was not huge, but was encouraging enough to arouse a desire for more national campaigns.

In England, many Georgeists were coming to the same conclusion as the American Georgeists—that it was futile to attempt cooperation with the major political parties, and that the only hope was in independent party action. An International Single Tax Conference was held at Oxford in 1923. There was intense discussion as to the value of attempting to work through the Liberal and Labor Parties, after so many years of disappointing stalemates, despite the presence of several courageous Georgeist Members of Parliament. There was a split between those who favored working with the present political set-up for whatever advances could be secured, and those who advocated an independent party to stand for the Georgeist reform in its fullness. The result was the founding of the Commonwealth Land Party, led by Graham Peace.

In America, the Single Tax Party decided to enter the national election of 1924. At their convention, Oscar Geiger urged the group to change the name of the Party, since the term "single tax" was a misnomer, and did not suggest all the implications of the Georgeist philosophy of freedom. The name of the Party was thereupon changed to the same as that of their English colleagues—the Commonwealth Land Party. At the same time (January 1924) the SINGLE TAX REVIEW changed its name to LAND AND FREEDOM.

The 1924 candidates were William J. Wallace for President, and John C. Lincoln for Vice-President. The candidates spoke at schools, forums and clubs, and received a good deal of press notice. The vote this time was not formidable, but Georgeists are not easily discouraged. However, this was to be the last nation-wide Single Tax campaign.

Fellow Travellers

A number of famous men, prominent in the political, civic, educational and literary worlds, have endorsed the Georgeist philosophy in one way or another. While these men may perhaps not be termed "Georgeists" in the full sense of the word, they have been "fellow travellers." Accepting Louis F. Post, Joseph Fels, Tom L. Johnson and Samuel Seabury as true followers of George, let us glance at some of our other friends through the pages of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW and LAND AND FREEDOM.

John Dewey, America's foremost philosopher, has often praised Henry George as a great social philosopher. His famous remark on George is quoted on the masthead page of this issue.

Hamlin Garland, the "dean of American letters," was a friend of Henry George, and in the early days appeared often at Georgeist gatherings. At a dinner given in his honor by the Manhattan Single Tax Club, he said: "Today our numbers are legion. The principles enunciated by Mr. George are being applied in a dozen adroit ways; not as 'Single Tax measures,' but under other names. Of this we do not complain. All we ask is to see the work done."

Edwin Markham, beloved American poet, was also often present at Georgeist meetings. His "Man With the Hoe" was reviewed by Joseph Dana Miller—the first review to appear in the East.

Elbert Hubbard, the famous Roycroft and author of the "Scrapbook," was deeply impressed by George, and published a brilliant essay on George's life and teachings. His "Scrapbook" also contains one of Joseph Dana Miller's outstanding pieces of verse, "A Hymn of Hate," in which the horrors of War are decried.

We have already spoken of Leo Tolstoy. As the years went on, Tolstoy was becoming more and more convinced that the Georgeist reform was the salvation of civilization.

George Bernard Shaw has from time to time acknowledged the influence of Henry George on his own ideas. He asserts that this influence was responsible for the founding of the Fabian Society. Of course, Shaw and the Fabians, while acclaiming George, would say "he didn't go far enough."

Many others prominent in the world of letters have endorsed George's views. Brand Whitlock embraced the Georgeist doctrine. Opie Read, the famous novelist, declared himself in favor of Georgeist reform in an interview reported in the REVIEW. Herbert D. Quick, another famous author, endorsed the philosophy, and his last article was written for the REVIEW. Frederic C. Howe and Lincoln Steffens, it has been noted, worked with the Joseph Fels Commission. Helen Keller, Kathleen Norris and many other writers have accepted the truths expounded by Henry George.

In the field of politics, many English statesmen were influenced by George during the first decade of the twentieth century when the English government "declared war on poverty." Outstanding among the measures proposed was land value taxation, endorsed by Lord Asquith, Winston Churchill, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and Lloyd George. A later fellow traveller was Philip Snowden, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

In America, Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis was deeply interested in Henry George. He requested M.

N. Norwalk to translate for the SINGLE TAX REVIEW an article on the land question in Palestine, written in Yiddish. Woodrow Wilson seems to have been interested in George. Louis F. Post testifies that Wilson always kept a copy of "Progress and Poverty" on his desk. Col. George W. Goethals, engineer-in-chief of the Panama Canal, was a whole-hearted Georgeist. Surgeon General William C. Gorgas, the medical supervisor of the Panama Canal, declared that most medical problems were due to poverty, and that the solution to poverty was the Single Tax. Herbert Bigelow and Newton D. Baker declared themselves Single Taxers, but said "it is a matter for the future." Albert Einstein, world famous physicist, acknowledges his indebtedness to Henry George for the latter's beautiful synthesis of natural laws.

Henri Lambert, noted Belgian economist, was particularly impressed by Henry George's views on free trade. At the close of the World War he wrote an article for the SINGLE TAX REVIEW on "The Way to Salvation—an Economic Peace." In it he said: "The only remaining chance of salvation for civilization lies in the preservation by England, and the adoption by Germany, France and the United States, of a policy of international economic freedom and morality."

One of the most interesting figures of a couple of decades ago was Raymond Robins, brilliant lecturer, official and unofficial ambassador to many countries. Mr. Robins reported to Joseph Dana Miller an interview he had with Nikolai Lenin, leader of the newly formed Soviet Union. Robins asked Lenin why he did not apply the taxation of land values. Lenin replied: "The proper application of the Georgean taxation of land values is a tax on the mentality of a people and beyond the capacity of a nation not ten percent of whom have learned to read. They cannot understand it. They can only understand socialism at present. Some day, with a higher average intelligence, we may adopt the taxation of land values and enjoy economic freedom, but not now."

Samuel Gompers, founder and first president of the American Federation of Labor, was a close friend of Henry George. However, in an issue of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW (1922), Joseph Dana Miller criticized Gompers for publicly offering palliatives for the solution of the economic problem, such as public works, and not mentioning the Georgeist reform as the real solution. Gompers replied to this criticism as follows: "I have declared and now say that I am a Single Taxer. I believe the Single Tax to be the most practical, effective and generally advantageous tax which can be imposed, but you take me to task because in my article on 'Abolish Unemployment' I did not declare for the Single Tax as a remedy for Unemployment. All I need say in reply is that the organized labor movement cannot

wait for the establishment of the Single Tax system to have our unemployed workmen at work."

In reply to Gompers, Mr. Miller pointed out that the Single Tax had been on the ballot in Oregon and California with many hundreds of thousands of votes; but "it does not appear from the records that Mr. Gompers was impelled to add his enormous influence to increase the vote in these States, yet had he done so, and kept at it, the movement would by this time have been much further advanced than his own program of public works . . . If Mr. Gompers sees the truth as Single Taxers see it, it is his duty to announce it publicly, to proclaim it bravely."

In 1929, Mr. Miller disclosed that Princess Alice of Greece was deeply interested in the Georgeist principles. In an interview, Mrs. Fiske Warren quoted the Greek princess as saying, "A tax on the value of land leads to an open opportunity for every one who works." Princess Alice was collaborating with Pavlos Giannelia (now our French correspondent) in translating Georgeist literature into Greek.

Joseph Dana Miller, the Writer

As we have said, Joseph Dana Miller was greatly respected in the literary world. His style was commended for its pure, simple and rounded quality. His clarity of expression, his mastery of the English language, and his keen comments in both verse and prose, won for him the reputation of being the greatest writer, next to Henry George, in the movement.

Miller was sought after by leading periodicals, here and abroad. Among the articles he wrote for magazines were the following: "The Fallacious Doctrine of Work," *Valley Magazine*; "Theodore Roosevelt and Tom L. Johnson—a Contrast," *The Arena*; "The Income Tax," *Belford's Magazine*; "The Difficulties of Democracy," *International Journal of Ethics* (Miller considered this his best article. Louis Adamic praises it highly in "My America"); "The Single Tax and American Municipalities," *National Municipal Review*; "Has the Single Tax Made Progress," *Dearborn Independent*.

One of Miller's finest achievements was "The Single Tax Year Book." It was a history, statement of principles and study of the application of the single tax. It was a work of nearly 500 pages, edited by Joseph Dana Miller, and published in 1917. This Year Book received many press notices and secured a wide distribution. It was placed in nearly 1000 libraries throughout the world, and many of them deemed it an invaluable source book.

Another of Mr. Miller's volumes appeared under the self-explanatory title, "Thirty Years of Verse Making." This was published in 1926. Mr. Miller insisted on calling his efforts "verse," not "poetry." In this compilation, the cream of many years of work, the verses were classified un-

der the following headings: Poems of Social Aspiration; Tributes to Notables; From the Library; Fields, Woods and Sea; Verses Occasional and Topical; and, In Lighter Vein.

Joseph Dana Miller's writings in LAND AND FREEDOM itself, over a period of four decades, especially his editorials (which appeared successively under the title of "Editorials," "Current Comment," and finally, "Comment and Reflection"), constitute a vast epic commentary on world affairs viewed in the light of fundamental economics.

Aroused over an issue, Miller's pen was something to be reckoned with. When the soldiers returned from the overseas war in 1919, and the Lane Report informed the nation that there was no way in which the soldiers could be replaced in the nation's industrial life, Miller blazed away. "This is the final smirch on America's honor. It makes us the laughing stock of the world. It is our punishment for our betrayal to civilization during three shameful years, for our shallow sentiment, false heroics and theatrical posturing. . . The statesmen who can think of nothing better than to consign our war-worn veterans to the swamp and the desert, are of the same timber as those who allowed the doors of opportunity to close in the rear of the recruits as they left home to defend their country, our own and civilization itself . . . The execrations of posterity will weigh heavy on the memories of those who, with their hands on the helm of state, failed in capacity or duty and guided her upon the rocks."

Mr. Miller proved his awareness of the real forces at work in his comments on the international scene. He said this of the Russian revolution: "We venture the prediction that as the Bolshevik experiment develops, it will be found that its chief contribution to human progress will be its exemplification of the policies to be avoided by nations who wish to improve their social conditions and its complete and triumphal refutation of the sophistries of Karl Marx and his followers." He saw the Fascist revolution in Italy as a reactionary revolution against the radicals then in control. "A resort to physical force by radicals invites the use of force by reactionaries."

Mr. Miller's comments had their humorous side. When the New School for Social Research was established, Miller greeted it thus: ". . . The New School for Social Research is now launched. All questions concerning man's social relations are now in a fair way of being solved. We rejoice at the announcement that 'there will be an attempt at factual rather than normative generalization,' and that 'an attempt will be made to explain the implicit assumptions involved in the prevailing technical treatment of such subjects as frequency distribution, types and averages, measures of dispersion, etc.'

"On Thursdays the Course includes: 'Relation of the theory of errors to statistical theory. Theory and tech-

nique of the mathematical treatment of statistical frequency curves. The statistical problem of two variables. Linear and non-linear correlation. Importance of the equations of the regression lines as representing empirical laws. Etc., etc.'

"We lay down this announcement. Perhaps our levity will seem unpardonable, but we felt like Artemus Ward: 'We busted into tears and resolved to lead a different life—not necessarily a better life, but different.'"

Many of Mr. Miller's articles and editorials were reprinted in pamphlet form, at the request of many readers. Among them were: "Jones' Itemized Rent Bill," "Has the Single Tax Made Progress," "What is it that is Taught as Political Economy," and a keen "Comment and Reflection," written as late as 1938, criticizing President Roosevelt.

The Superlative Twenties

The nineteen-twenties ushered in another period of that hectic "prosperity" that does not deceive Georgeists. But the Georgeists were falling into disrepute. Their dire predictions seemed so fantastic.

Miller and his co-workers struggled valiantly to keep aloft the light of the Georgeist philosophy in its fullness. He strove to recapture that vision and determination which characterized the early days of the movement. He inspired the workers in the movement to carry on.

In those disappointing hours, another light flared on the horizon. In 1925 the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation was established. Robert Schalkenbach, recently deceased, made provision in his will for this Foundation, which was to publish the works of Henry George and encourage such literature as would be helpful in the propagation of the Georgeist philosophy. Mr. Miller joyfully featured this good news in LAND AND FREEDOM. It was another milestone in the progress of the movement. It was another step making the movement more clearcut. Henceforth Georgeists would not have to rely on an occasional publisher who would be willing to print George's literature. Here were the resources for doing so, right within the movement. Such steps had to be taken, since Henry George's works were so shamefully neglected by the contemporary publishing houses.

The Schalkenbach bequest provoked many editorials in leading newspapers. An editorial appeared in the *New York Sun*, under the title, "An Odd Bequest." After nebulously "refuting" the Georgeist proposals, the editorial concluded with this strange moral: "Even if the Single Tax were regarded as thoroughly sound by current thought, a will which provides for the indefinite propagation of any given man's set of ideas courts future difficulties . . . Suppose the reforms aimed at are accomplished? . . . Must propaganda in favor of the reform go on and on forever?" Of course this puerile argument could be applied to any work, not excluding the Bible. However, there were many favorable

newspaper editorials on the bequest. The *Brooklyn Eagle* and the *Philadelphia North American* made favorable comment, and asserted that it was a good work.

In 1926 an International Conference was held at Copenhagen, Denmark, sponsored by the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade. Georgeists from seventeen nations convened. One of the steps taken at this Conference was the sending of a message to the League of Nations for the consideration of the Council and Assembly. Another message was sent by the Union a year later on "The Interdependence of the Economic Causes of War and of Industrial Depression." It was addressed to the International Economic Conference of the League of Nations held at Geneva in May, 1927.

The year 1926 marked the inauguration of another series of Georgeist conferences. The Henry George Foundation of America initiated its annual Henry George Congresses, which have been held every year since then. The first Congress was the year of the Sesquicentennial Celebration of the Declaration of Independence, at Philadelphia. The Georgeists convened at that city, and, seizing upon the occasion, issued "A New Declaration of Economic Independence." Another of the Henry George Foundation's accomplishments was the purchasing of Henry George's birthplace in Philadelphia.

1929 was the fiftieth anniversary of the appearance of "Progress and Poverty." It was celebrated by a Fiftieth Anniversary Edition published by the Schalkenbach Foundation; it is the edition still distributed by the Foundation.

In 1929 also was held another International Conference, this time at Edinburgh, Scotland. Georgeists from twenty-four nations convened and reported activities and progress throughout the world. Engineer D. de Clerq spoke on the reclamation of the Zuider Zee, which was being organized along Georgeist lines. The land was to be leased by the government, and the government had refused to sell the reclaimed land. In Denmark, steady progress in land value taxation was reported, as well as in Australia, New Zealand, and municipalities in many other countries.

While in Great Britain for this Conference, Mrs. Anna George de Mille, daughter of Henry George, stopped at London for an interview with Philip Snowden at 11 Downing Street. She reported the interview in LAND AND FREEDOM: "Although he spoke conservatively and couched his statements in diplomatic phrases that made neither promises nor guarantees, I hold the firm conviction that we are going to see our beliefs fought for in the open political fields in England, and that Philip Snowden will be in the frontline trenches, directing the campaign." It was only two years later that the battle for the separate valuation of land and improvements was fought in Parliament, with Snowden leading the battle.

Henry George School of Social Science

During the dark days of the early depression, there was a man with a vision, who decided that now was the time to realize his dream. The man was Oscar H. Geiger—treasurer and editorial associate of *LAND AND FREEDOM*—and the dream was an institution where the philosophy of Henry George might be taught. He consulted Joseph Dana Miller, who enthusiastically endorsed the idea. And so, on January 1, 1932, the Henry George School of Social Science was founded, with Oscar H. Geiger as Director.

At first the School did not appear to be an institution at all—it was just Mr. Geiger lecturing here and there, under the auspices of the Manhattan Single Tax Club and the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. But the faith of Messrs. Geiger and Miller was that it would grow and become a great and influential institution. The office of *LAND AND FREEDOM* was adopted as headquarters of the School.

The March-April 1932 issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM* carried a feature story of the School and an ardent plea that Georgeists support this new and worthy venture. "At the Henry George Congress in Baltimore," wrote Miller, "Dr. Mark Millikin, who is one of the sponsors of the new movement, suggested the founding of a Henry George University. Here is the beginning that may eventuate in the establishment of such a university."

The School and its educational program was enthusiastically received by Georgeists throughout the country. The financial support, however, was somewhat disappointing, but Mr. Geiger, moved by a deep faith, carried on and struggled to build the School on firm and secure foundations. At great personal sacrifice he devoted almost his entire savings to keep the venture alive, and pure. He was truly a martyr.

The School grew, so that in each succeeding issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, more and more progress could be reported. "Mr. Geiger seems determined to make the School a United Movement Effort rather than a one-man institution." "If success is the accomplishment of what one sets out to do, the Henry George School of Social Science can surely be accounted a success." But it must not be thought that Mr. Geiger was so engrossed with the educational program of the School that he had no interest in the larger purpose of the institution. He constantly iterated that the School was "but a means to an end, i.e., the attainment of our reforms."

Through the issues of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, we trace the growth of this School. Step by step it unfolded. A Board of Trustees was organized. It secured a Charter from the New York State Board of Regents. John Dewey consented to be its Honorary President. Within a year it had larger headquarters at 211 West 79th Street, New York City. "An address that is the making of an epoch," Mr. Miller called

it. Classes were held every day, with Mr. Geiger as instructor and "Progress and Poverty" as the text-book. The students, fired with the enthusiasm imparted by their master, formed a Student Alumni Council, headed by Helen D. Denbigh, and conceived of a Henry George Fellowship which was to rally all the followers of Henry George together. "The students have taken hold!" Miller wrote joyfully in *LAND AND FREEDOM*.

Oscar H. Geiger, the Founder and Director, passed away June, 1934. But he lived long enough to see the beginning of an assured growth. "The School must go on!" was the watchword of Oscar Geiger's loyal followers. The Student Alumni Council, the Henry George Fellowship, all rallied together to continue the great educational work. They were the true apostles of the Founder.

The founding of the Henry George School of Social Science was another milestone in the progress of the Henry George movement. It was another step in the clarification of the movement. It was another of the resources the followers of Henry George were creating in order to carry the movement to success. Since Henry George had been unjustly ignored by institutions of learning, a special institution had to be founded devoted to filling what Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown calls "the void in college curricula."

Year by year the Henry George School continued growing. An increasing number of students took its courses, an increasing number of *leaders* were made. Extensions of the School were established in cities and towns all over the country. Its fame spread to other nations. Georgeists in Canada, England, Denmark and Australia emulated the School and its educational program. In Canada, a School of Economic Science was launched. England took the name of Henry George School of Social Science. In Australia it was the New South Wales School of Social Science. In Denmark it was the Okoteknisk Højskole. The Henry George School method also influenced such later Georgeist organizations as We, the Citizens, and the School of Democracy.

The idea of the Henry George Fellowship was enthusiastically taken up by graduates of the Henry George School in various cities. Chapters of the Fellowship were formed, and a Federated Fellowship was established. Joseph Dana Miller saw this as a step toward the goal of a United Movement Effort. He wrote: "Disproving the old theory that the Single Taxers were too individualistic to organize and achieve their common goal, the Federated Chapters of the Henry George Fellowship have demonstrated that Georgeists can and will cooperate."

Today the Henry George School occupies a large 5-story building at 30 East 29th Street, New York City, with Mr. Frank Chodorov as Director. The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation also has its offices in the same structure.

Unto the End

From the heights, as a spiritual leader of the Henry George movement, the aging Joseph Dana Miller continued with undiminished zeal and ability to chronicle the epic of a mighty movement to free mankind. The hands trembled a little, the eyes were somewhat dimmed—but the mind was as clear, the pen as keen as ever. The parade went by . . . The Henry George School was growing. In California, most persistent center of political action, Judge Jackson Ralston was waging a campaign to repeal the sales tax and substitute a land value tax. Overseas, the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade was spreading its influence despite darkening clouds on the international scene. The old controversies within the movement were again being waged: To organize or not to organize; is interest justified; is political action premature; the School of 1897 versus an improved and modernized science of economics; etc., etc.

And Joseph Dana Miller, venerable sage, was growing more kindly, more tolerant. Around him, the Samuel Johnson of the movement, the Georgeists flocked. They were all his children, all working for the same cause. Let them all have their say. Something good will come out of it.

The November-December 1938 issue was the last number of *LAND AND FREEDOM* edited by Joseph Dana Miller. As long as he was able he appeared every day at the office. After that issue, ebbing health did not permit him to continue. But this, his last issue—did it show any signs of decline, or senility? Let us glance at it:—A powerful editorial on the current trend toward collectivism, and a clarion call to return to Liberty—a clear-headed evaluation of organization and political action, and a plea for unified Georgeist effort—the story of the California campaign by Jackson Ralston—an article by Benjamin W. Burger demonstrating the possibility of collecting the rent of land under existing Federal laws—the program of the newly formed Tax Relief Association, an organization intended to interest business men, by Victor A. Rule—and the news of the Georgeist movement throughout the world.

During Mr. Miller's last illness in the early part of 1939, the business and editing of *LAND AND FREEDOM* was assumed by Charles Jos. Smith, who now conducts the enterprise as Trustee under the last will and testament of the Founder. Mr. Smith enjoys the collaboration of his co-editors, Mr. Jos. Hiram Newman and Mr. Robert Clancy.

On May 8, 1939, Joseph Dana Miller passed away. The May-June 1939 number was devoted to his memory. Tributes poured in from every part of the world. They were followed by a ringing appeal that *LAND AND FREEDOM* should continue the work of the Founder. And it has,

L'Envoi

LAND AND FREEDOM, after Miller's death, continued to be just what it had been in the past—the voice of the Henry George movement. If the world wished to know what was the status of the Georgeist cause, it might turn to the pages of this journal.

With the clouds of world conflict again darkening Georgeists from all over the world convened at New York in 1939 to celebrate the Centenary of Henry George. It was fateful that September 2nd, the hundredth anniversary of the birth of that great economist and social philosopher should witness the outbreak of a cataclysm that he prophesied would engulf our civilization.

With these terrible world events accumulating, *LAND AND FREEDOM* continues to perform its mission, continues the tradition of Joseph Dana Miller. It continues to exhort the people to turn to Liberty while there is yet time. It stands for the philosophy of Henry George in all its power. And it stands for a United Effort on the part of all who embrace the philosophy of freedom to pull together for the great work of leading the Georgeist reform to success—the only salvation for mankind.

L & F and the Biosophical Institute

WE have been fortunate in making the acquaintance of the Biosophical Institute, an organization devoted to peace and character education. The Institute welcomes all views that tend toward better understanding and more peaceful relations among men. In keeping with such a policy, it has offered its radio facilities to this journal and already we have been on the air twice, over Station WLTH, New York City.

Pleased with our radio presentation of the Georgeist philosophy, Mr. Francis Merchant, Program Director, invited us to give a talk before a group which meets weekly at the headquarters of the Institute. For this occasion, Mr. Robert Clancy and Mr. Charles Jos. Smith engaged in a dialogue before an audience of about 75 persons. The dialogue was based upon "You and America's Future," the pamphlet prepared by Robert Clancy and William W. Newcomb. The audience appeared well pleased with the presentation, showing remarkable intelligence in the type of questions put to the speakers after the dialogue.

We feel that a fine relationship has been established, and we endorse the lofty purposes of the Biosophical Institute. Its headquarters are at the Hotel Dauphin, 67th Street and Broadway, in New York City.

The Land Tax Fight in Oklahoma

By TOM W. CHEEK
President, Oklahoma Farmers' Union

ON November 5, 1940, an important event took place in Oklahoma. The people of the State carried a fight for a Graduated Land Tax to the polls, actually obtaining a majority of more than two to one—and yet the measure was defeated because of undemocratic rule.

The Graduated Land Tax Bill grew out of a very real and urgent need in Oklahoma. The State is rapidly becoming depopulated, and nearly 75% of the land is farmed by tenants, due to the blight of land speculation and land monopoly, as well as unjust taxes. Before a special Committee of the State Congress, I testified that 74,000 people had been forced to emigrate from Oklahoma because of these conditions. In one little town in Caddo County alone, fifty families had been sold out for mortgages or taxes, and had left for California. Giant farm holdings are spreading, and more and more family-sized farms are being pushed out of existence.

This is a very strange set of conditions for this State, because originally the Oklahoma territory was intended to be reserved for home owners. It was intended that speculation be prevented by granting the land to those who would use it solely for homes. But the entering wedge for the speculators was a small unallotted balance in the Indian Territory. By 1903, one-fourth of the land was in the hands of non-producing owners.

This situation did not go unchallenged. As far back as 1905 there was agitation for the Graduated Land Tax as a solution to the growing problem of farm tenancy. In 1908 State Senator Campbell Russell introduced a land tax amendment, and it was passed in both houses—to be defeated in the Courts on a technicality. In 1914 a land tax bill was presented as an initiatory measure, and it actually obtained two-thirds of the votes cast—but was defeated through fraudulent ballot tactics.

Now, more than ever—with three-fourths of the land in the hands of monopolists—Oklahoma needs the graduated land tax. The Oklahoma Farmers' Union realized this and decided to put to the voters of Oklahoma the question: Shall a Graduated Land Tax amendment to the State Constitution be adopted? A determined effort was made to submit the question as an initiatory measure at the general election on November 5, 1940. A petition was circulated (Initiative Petition No. 145) by the Union, and the names of 172,000 voters in favor of the amendment were secured.

The amendment to be decided upon by the voters was as follows:

A BILL ENTITLED AN ACT

Adopting a Constitutional Amendment Authorizing a Graduated Land Tax and Including Vitalizing Provisions to Make the Same Effective; Same to Constitute a New Article of the Constitution, to Be Numbered XII-B and to Read as Follows:

Be it Enacted by the People of the State of Oklahoma:

ARTICLE XII-B

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy and the purpose of the people of Oklahoma to encourage home ownership and to discourage excessive land holdings in this State by any person, and to levy and collect on land such graduated or other tax as they may deem best for the public weal.

UNLESS OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY LAW IT IS DECLARED:

(a) Except the real estate of common carriers authorized to be held by them by the Constitution of this State, and except land covered by the first Proviso in Section two (2) of Article twenty-two (XXII) of this Constitution until the expiration of the time stipulated herein, and except land devoted to forestation, reforestation, or to reclamation, and lands operated principally for grazing purposes; the owner, whether legal or equitable, whether person, firm, association, joint stock association, or corporation and whether resident or not of this State, of any land in this State, in excess of six hundred forty (640) acres shall, in addition to other ad valorem taxes, pay upon such excess the following annual tax for the purpose of State Old Age Security, which tax is hereby levied, to wit:

For each one dollar of valuation of such excess acreage, as assessed for taxation ad valorem in the preceding year, the following schedule:

For the first year following the adoption of this amendment—

Five mills where such excess does not exceed 640 acres;

Ten mills on such excess exceeding 640 acres and not exceeding 1,280 acres;

Fifteen mills on such excess exceeding 1,280 acres.

For the next succeeding year, such tax shall be—

Ten mills upon excess not exceeding 640 acres;
 Fifteen mills upon such excess exceeding 640
 acres and not exceeding 1,280 acres;
 Twenty mills upon such excess not exceeding
 1,280 acres.

For the next succeeding year such tax shall
 be—

Fifteen mills upon the first 640 acres of such
 excess;
 Twenty mills upon such excess exceeding 640
 acres and not exceeding 1,280 acres;
 Twenty-five mills upon all excess exceeding
 1,280 acres.

Five mills shall continue thus to be added to each
 succeeding step of such tax for each following year
 until such annual tax rate shall reach 40, 45, and
 50 mills as maxima:

Provided, that land of an assessed value of \$12,-
 000 may, at his option, be exempt to any owner in
 lieu of only the first 640 acres herein provided: And
 Provided further, that where land now owned is
 sold for a home within five years from the adop-
 tion hereof, 98 per cent of all tax theretofore levied
 thereon hereunder shall be refunded to the owner
 paying same.

(b) The time when the tax levied hereunder is
 payable, and when delinquent, and the penalty and
 lien for non-payment shall be as in the case of other
 ad valorem taxes; and the State Tax Commission
 is hereby authorized and directed to collect said
 tax and to make needful rules and regulations and
 prescribed forms for the enforcement thereof and
 to settle all questions that arise hereunder, grant-
 ing to any taxpayer a hearing and the right to offer
 evidence, with an appeal from the final order of the
 Tax Commission to the District Court of the
 county where any portion of the land is situated,
 in the same manner as appeals from the county
 court. The Tax Commission is authorized to retain
 two (2) per cent of all tax collected hereunder as
 recoupment for their expense therein.

(c) The above tax levies shall be considered as
 separate and independent each of all the others and
 in the event any part of this proposition shall be
 held to be invalid, inoperative or ineffectual then
 such invalid, inoperative, or ineffectual part shall
 not affect the other parts hereof.

* * *

A leaflet explaining the amendment as a measure to pre-
 vent land monopoly, and urging support of it was circulat-
 ed among 300,000 voters of Oklahoma prior to the Novem-
 ber election.

Together with the Graduated Land Tax, a Cooperative
 Hospital Bill was also introduced as a similar initiatory
 measure. Both were fought bitterly by the press and
 the privileged class. The State Chamber of Commerce issued
 statements to the effect that all initiatory amendments
 are dangerous, experimental, and not to be considered in
 these critical times. In fact, if it had not been for their
 tactics, the land tax measure would have been introduced
 five years ago.

The controlled press also lashed out against the measure.
 The metropolitan papers are owned by the vested interests,
 who are always opposed to any legislation depriving them
 of their special privileges. It is significant, however, that
 nearly all small independent newspapers were in favor of
 the land tax.

Though we had bitter opposition from the vested inter-
 ests, we won much valuable help. Among the supporters
 of the land tax bill was Judge James I. Phelps, veteran jurist
 and former chief justice of the Oklahoma State Supreme
 Court. Judge Phelps was convinced that the most impor-
 tant question before the citizenship of the state was to stop
 the rapid trend toward land monopoly, and urged the pas-
 sage of the land tax as the solution. Another welcome sup-
 porter was Judge Orel Busby, who believed that every
 farmer should have his own farm, saw the danger in in-
 creasing farm tenancy, and gave the Union his endorsement.

We were also glad to receive the support of Labor. The
 Oklahoma State Federation of Labor, in its 36th annual
 convention at Tulsa, passed unanimously two strong resolu-
 tions endorsing the Farmers' Union Graduated Land Tax
 and Cooperative Hospital petitions. They resolved to "ac-
 tively support the Graduated Land Tax by explaining the
 measure to others, making speeches, distributing literature
 that they might understand the importance of preventing
 land monopoly." Many independent candidates to the Okla-
 homa legislature supported our program; among them was
 Tom McLemore, independent candidate to the U. S. Con-
 gress.

In our own paper, *The Oklahoma Union Farmer*, we con-
 stantly stressed the need for the Graduated Land Tax, and
 in every issue we featured articles on this most important
 question.

On November 5, all voters were handed our two initiative
 Ballots as they entered the polls. The Graduated Land Tax
 measure was State Question No. 215, and the Cooperative
 Hospital Bill was State Question No. 241.

The Graduated Land Tax carried by a total vote of 408,-
 559 as against 196,711 dissenting votes. The Cooperative
 Hospital bill carried by a total vote of 294,346 as against
 212,701 dissenting votes. This victory should inspire every
 citizen in the nation to renewed confidence in democratic
 government, and make clear that the people themselves are

capable of deciding any great question at the ballot box.

The people by their vote decided that they are opposed to land monopoly and that they want the Graduated Land Tax. *But*—as our procedure now stands, *the silent vote was counted against us*. That is, the people who *did not* vote on the question, either for or against, were counted *against us*.

Representative government cannot long endure and tolerate this undemocratic rule. It has no place in a democracy. The people who go to the polls and vote for a measure and the opposition who vote against it should be recorded, and those votes only should determine that measure.

The resentment against landlordism was clearly evidenced on November 5. The use of land for speculation and investment rather than for a farm home has been rejected by the people. The vote for the Graduated Land Tax is a mandate to the present legislature that the constituents in 73 counties are overwhelmingly in favor of the tax.

The Oklahoma Farmers' Union is now going to do the only thing that can be done—that is, to fight for a Constitutional Amendment that will make the initiative and referendum a reality in Oklahoma, so as to insure democratic rule. We are going to get together all the voters of the State, and present a joint resolution directing the Secretary of State to refer to the people of Oklahoma for their approval or rejection a proposed Amendment to Section 3 of Article V of the State Constitution, to safeguard the right of the people to legislate for themselves.

Our program for 1941 includes a plan to organize the voters on the question of democratic rule. Let the controlled press and the vested interests exult for the time being. But the Graduated Land Tax shall be fought for again.

The Critics Criticized

By JACOB SCHWARTZMAN

[This is the second of a series of articles by the same author, dealing with the objections of noted economists to the doctrines of Henry George, and the refutation of such objections. The first in the series, published in the November-December 1940 issue, answered the objections of Prof. F. W. Taussig—Ed.]

IN this article I shall examine the arguments of Prof. Henry Rogers Seager, who in his "Principles of Economics" (Henry Holt & Co.) attacks Henry George with a surprising hostility.

Henry Rogers Seager

[Henry Rogers Seager was born in 1870, and died in 1930, in Kiev, Russia, whither he had gone to study the Soviet philosophy. An extremely conservative economist, he clung tenaciously to his interpretation of the laissez-faire doctrine. He was Professor of Economics at Columbia University from 1905 to 1930. He believed in meliorative activities within the existing economic structure, and was secretary of the Shipbuilding Labor Adjustment Board and

president of the Economic Association. "Principles of Economics" is his most noted work.]

Seager's eight objections follow:

1—Poverty has undoubtedly persisted in spite of progress, but has not increased with it.

2—It is untrue that improvements increase rent. If it were true, the condition of the masses would never improve.

3—Henry George's claims were extravagant and unwarranted.

4—No relation exists between the rent fund and the legitimate needs of government. Two cities of the same size and the same rent fund may spend different amounts for public purposes.

5—No tax is desirable as a single tax.

6—Confiscation of land would be a monstrous piece of injustice. It might be countenanced if any rational ground for it existed, but under the circumstances, it is unqualifiedly condemned. It would "overturn an established institution."

7—Impractical it certainly is, because present landowners paid a purchase price for their land.

8—It is impossible to distinguish the value of improvements from the value of land. (a) If we tax improvements as well as land, we would discourage production. (b) If we tax land only, it would be difficult to determine which is, and which is not, land.

(1)

I think that any person not hostilely inclined would readily admit that as a nation progresses in culture and inventions, poverty increases in the degree to which access to the land is lessened. This country is a good example. One hundred years ago, when America was still in the formative stages, poverty was not a serious problem. Today, the head of our Government admits that one-third of the population is ill-clothed, ill-housed and ill-fed. Today our brilliant leaders are unable to cope with the vast and miserable army of our unemployed, except to find "useful employment" for them in prisons, WPA projects and home relief.

(2)

To deny that improvements increase rent is colossal mendacity. Improvements increase rent in two ways: First, by facilitating production and increasing the amount of wealth, thereby increasing the value of land already used—since all wealth must be produced on and with land; second, by extending production and research, thereby compelling a demand for more land, and thus pushing out the margin of production.

The automobile industry, besides making Detroit the fourth largest city in the United States, has raised rents throughout the country. The development of the automobile, by increasing the number of industries and jobs, by adding to the amount of national wealth, by spurring other

improvements, has not only raised rents throughout the nation, but throughout the entire world. The development of the radio, electricity, telephone, aeroplane, have all added to the national wealth and the increase of rent.

The mass of people demand improvements because they expect them to lighten toil and make living easier. Improvements do tend to have that effect, but the private ownership of land intervenes. By increasing rents inordinately and withholding land from use, that venerable institution throws men out of work and causes competition between men and machines, as well as between men and men.

(3)

No explanation follows the assertion that George's "extreme claims were extravagant and unwarranted." We can therefore answer this only by asserting the contrary. Nothing that tells the truth is extravagant and unwarranted. If anything, George was moderate in both language and anger.

(4)

The objection that there is no relation between the rent fund and the legitimate needs of government because two cities similar in size and rent have different budgets, might be answered with the following illustration:

Suppose Edwards employs Jones and Brown, and pays each twenty dollars a week. Jones spends his twenty dollars during the week, while Brown spends only fifteen, and places five dollars in the bank. Following Seager's argument, Edwards would say to Brown: "I pay Jones twenty dollars a week, and he spends the whole sum; therefore a definite relation exists between his wages and his spending. I pay you twenty dollars too, but you spend only fifteen; therefore there is no such relation between your wages and your budget. I must cut down your salary five dollars." To which Brown should reply: "Regardless of how much I spend, that is no concern of yours. I earn twenty dollars a week, and the money is mine to do with as I please. I choose to save part of it so that, if conditions arise, I will have it for future needs."

Regardless of what a city's budget is, the rent fund was created by the people, it is their rightful earnings, and only they may decide how much and in what manner it is to be spent or saved for a future contingency.

(5)

The objection that no tax is desirable as a single tax is not explained by Seager. Perhaps he feels that it is not fair to discriminate against landowners and compel them to bear the whole burden of taxation, while other taxable values exist. The same objection may be interposed by a traveller who appropriates three-fourths of his fellow-traveller's wealth. He might complain disingenuously that it isn't fair for him to bear all the expenses of the journey when there are two undertaking the trip.

(6)

Having imagined that he has demonstrated that the single tax cannot be countenanced on any rational ground, Seager concludes that the confiscation of land would be a monstrous act. "It would overturn an established institution!" Just imagine the outraged feelings of Captain Kidd if, after all the years of building up his fortune, which required a great deal of labor and throat-slashing, an unfeeling government were to recover all his loot and gently reprimand our hero for his accumulations! Some better argument than that it is an "established institution" will have to be found for the institution of private landownership.

(7)

Seager believes he has found his justification of private ownership of land in the fact that the present owners paid a purchase price for their land. So would some citizen of Kalamazoo wave a certificate of ownership of the Brooklyn Bridge before an impassive judge, which certificate he purchased with hard-earned cash from a passing salesman.

We need not feel too concerned over those who purchased something which cannot belong to any one man—that is, concerned to the extent of allowing the injustice to remain. Under George's system, the purchaser's loss of investment will be more than offset by the new advantages and opportunities that arise.

Let us not fail to observe that the institution of private ownership of land can be traced to conquest and fraud; and that the great bulk of present day landholdings was obtained, not by purchase, but by inheritance and shady dealings.

(8)

(a) I have already answered this question in the previous article. However, answering it as presented by Seager, I will freely grant that if we tax improvements we discourage production. This is exactly the practice that Georgeists oppose. It is ironic that this objection should be presented by an advocate of things-as-they-are, including the present system of taxation which bears upon most of the things of human production.

(b) I have shown in my last article that it is possible and practicable to distinguish between improvements and land. Since this objection will again be encountered in other critics, I shall elaborate upon the question as the occasion arises.

Index for 1940, Vol. XL

INDEX for Volume XL (January-December, 1940) of LAND AND FREEDOM will be mailed free upon request, when accompanied by a (large) self-addressed stamped envelope, to subscribers who bind their copies as works of reference. The index consists of four pages and has an appropriate "key" for locating titles of articles, names of authors, subjects, etc.

Reconstruction in Great Britain

By DOUGLAS J. J. OWEN

CAPITAL wealth in the countries at war is being destroyed ruthlessly, whilst the land, from which all wealth is produced, remains indestructible by any bombing. [Portion deleted by censor.] The site remains, and can still be bought and sold as negotiable property. Whilst the mutual destruction of wealth goes on, discussion proceeds in Great Britain of plans for post-war reconstruction. The British Press and other forums of opinion are full of hopes of building a better social order on the ruins of the old. The demolition of slums by high explosives is almost welcomed, by some who don't live in them, as providing the opportunity for experiments in town-planning on the devastated areas. Blue prints of our new cities appear faster than the ground can be cleared for their application. The primary fact, so often overlooked, remains, that the private landowner is not dispossessed by the most intense bombing by the enemy. To paraphrase a famous saying: So much will still be owed, in the shape of land rent, by so many land-users, to so few land monopolists.

It will no doubt be matter for boasting, when the war is over, how well our British institutions have stood the strain. Certainly that hoary institution, older than Parliament itself and, so far more powerful, the land-owning interest, seems likely to survive the nation's ordeal, whatever else survives—unless, of course, the work of our Land Values Leagues succeeds and heed is taken of Henry George.

Proposals for betterment—their name is legion—are put forth for every aspect of our national life. In agriculture for example, the need for increased production of food-stuffs is constantly stressed, by authorities who ought to ask why such an obvious necessity should require lecturing about. Price-fixing with the aid of subsidies is advocated by one writer, another, equally expert, says that all the price-fixing in the world can never constitute an enduring land policy; so he advocates a Land Commission to regulate the rotation of crops and to have compulsory powers of purchase of land.

Another advocate of compulsory acquisition of uncultivated land is none other than the Conservative, Lord Winterton. Speaking in the House of Commons on December 4th, he said: "Not enough attention has been directed to the huge area of land in this country which is cultivable—not derelict, but not at present cultivated. Every acre bore corn or produced stock in the Napoleonic wars, and our position today is at least as grave as then." Our English Land Values Leagues have been pointing to those unused acres for years. It looks as though propaganda is having some effect at last. Lord Winterton, however, went on to

press for compulsory purchase as the cure, so he has not learnt his lesson complete.

None of these reforms seems to realize the fact that the mention of subsidies and public purchase of land will excite the expectations of landowners and tend to raise the speculative value of land. Land for farming purposes is already experiencing a boom. *Land & Liberty* gives many instances of the effect of war conditions on the growing of foodstuffs and consequently in the enhancing of land values.

A writer in the *Daily Telegraph*, London, is quoted as saying: "Everything derives from the land, whether it is food, clothes, buildings, drink or transport. But food and clothing come first. The result is that farms which grow crops and beasts, fruit and vegetables, poultry and pigs have steadily appreciated in value since the memorable 3rd of September 1939." The extent of the increase in price is indicated by the same writer's statement: "Knight, Frank and Rutley, a firm who have sold approximately 30,000 acres of land since the war began, tell me that on a broad, general average, prices have appreciated by from 15 to 20 per cent. They are still rising." Yet the experts on grass and crops and livestock ignore this rising obstacle to reconstruction and increased production in their calculations.

In the plans for rebuilding the derelict bombed areas we see the same lack of economic perspective. London areas rendered uninhabitable are still the property of this or that great landowner who will have to be consulted before rebuilding can begin. If as a preliminary step the tax-collector were sent to consult with the owners of new building sites as to the value of their land for taxing purposes, then those who want to reconstruct and make waste places habitable would be able to treat with landowners on a fairer footing. As it is, the absence of any tax on land values leaves the owner of land to exercise his monopoly rights even in the time of the nation's extremity. To cull from *Land & Liberty* (December 1940): The War Office could only acquire land for its needs in Croydon by using its compulsory powers, and the price had to be fixed by arbitration, and was equivalent to £1084 per acre. This land had practically no value when assessed for local taxation purposes. If the War Office could not treat with the owners except with compulsory powers, what chance has the ordinary town council or private builder when they want to erect houses for the homeless public? Had there been a tax on land values, even a moderate tax, the transaction would have been on more equal terms. This is the cornerstone rejected by reconstruction builders who pay no heed to the economics of "Progress and Poverty."

In ill-fated Coventry, the City Architect, Mr. D. E. Gibson has stated that the bombing has given them the chance of rebuilding "a dignified and fitting city center." In a lecture, he said: "Many citizens had despaired of this possibility before the bombing. High land values, among other factors, made it seem impossible. In a night all is changed. People are now asking themselves, Will the land-owners, with their often short-sighted and acquisitive outlook, again be allowed to smash the ideas of our twentieth-century Wrens?"

All this is to the point, but Mr. Gibson shows his own limitations when he comes to the remedy, for he concluded as follows: "For the good of the community private interests must be subordinated to public ones. The only solution for Great Britain now lies in some form of nationalization of all land. This could be achieved in a number of ways, one solution being to convert all free-hold property into leasehold to the State, with a 99 years' lease, which would at least give some control over building".

An ingenious proposal, but why not the simpler method of nationalizing the land-rent fund by progressive taxation of land values? Mr. Gibson may not have heard of Henry George though he shows, like many other public men in Great Britain today, that he cannot help being influenced by Georgeist educational work in the last generation or two in his recognition that the land value question is central to the problem.

A recent striking instance of the good results of the work of our Leagues is found in the Report of the special Committee of the Town Planning Institute. This report does not advocate a tax on land values—we must not expect too much. But it does emphasize the need for a national valuation of all land in the country "by one authority at one time upon uniform principles". This Committee does not recommend the nationalization of all land, but rather its compulsory purchase in urban or rural areas wherever required for purposes of planning. They say: "We are convinced that the chief obstacle of the achievement of positive results by statutory planning is that it is hampered on all sides by a multiplicity and variety of interests". The Committee also envisages a conflict of plans between those who wish to preserve rural amenities and those who want to expand the towns on new lines. The Committee wants to "check extravagant claims for schemes for the redevelopment of built-upon areas".

In commenting in its leader columns on this report the *Manchester Guardian* said: "But in the (bombed) districts streets are owned, perhaps, by a great many people, and more still draw profits from things as they are. All of these will be affected by the change for the better. They have drawn incomes from what has been condemned, and not only will they want to be compensated for their loss but will seek to share in any rise in the value of their property

through the planning authority's improvements". The *Guardian* endorses the proposal for an "unprejudiced valuation", and in this the workers in the Henry George movement may see signs of progress in public opinion. Our town-planners and reformers are "not far from the kingdom". To change the metaphor they are getting so near to the only solution that "if it were a dog it would bite them".

Town Planners have only themselves to blame if they find that the legislation they have sponsored is inadequate, and that they are compelled to join in the demand for land valuation. They were indifferent to, and in fact, many of their leaders actively opposed, the Snowden Land Value Finance Act of 1931. The Town Planning Acts, with their much lauded "betterment principle", which was their answer to land value taxation, they now find not merely inadequate but actually mischievous, for the basis of assessment for compensation takes no account of land value as such, does not separate land value from improvements, and exempts any land, however valuable, if it is vacant. The increase in land values resulting from town planning schemes was not to be taken for the community which financed the schemes, but to be handed over to other landowners whose land values were decreased by town planning. This decrease is not, of course, a "loss" to landowners in the strict sense, but only a reduction in the gains accruing to them by the presence and expenditure of the community. But they were to be insured against this out of increased land values which Town Planners prevented from returning to the community which created them. Now, nine years after, these well-meaning people* find they cannot get on with their plans without the valuation which they could have had in 1931 but for their own obstructionist tactics. It is still necessary to ask them if the valuation they want is to ascertain the true market value of the land apart from improvements. If not, their valuation will again be useless to them.

One more illustration of the trend of reconstruction thought may be given. Prof. C. H. Reilly, the great authority, describes the planners' task thus: "This general program must determine the planning of industry throughout the country: which towns should be allowed to grow, which should be curtailed by the removal of its factories, where the new towns are to be placed, which new coal-fields should be developed, which sources of water power, where land is to be reserved for national parks, where forests should be extended, where reduced. . . to decide the fate of that particular town, whether it should be allowed to hold a greater or less population".

*To whom Mr. Harold S. Bottenheim (editor of *The American City*) made his eloquent and powerful appeal at the Conference of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade in London, in 1936.

We may leave the well-meaning town-planners to settle with the country-planners, merely recommending to both a study of the law of economic rent and its application under conditions of freedom from land monopoly. One gem shines forth from Prof. Reilly's plan. He says: "Clearly speculation in land and building will have to be stopped". He does not say how this is to be done, leaving it no doubt to the economists. American readers may be sure that British land valuers will make the fullest use of this growing receptiveness of the public mind for the Georgean message, which is in itself a result of persistent advocacy over many years.

The Town Planning Committee, like other reform groups, recommends the expenditure of public money in payment to landowners for permission to reconstruct a devastated Britain. Not only do they thus create obstacles to their own schemes by causing inflated hopes and inflated values; they also bring discredit on all reconstruction efforts which begin by taking further large sums from the already overburdened taxpayers. Let the landowners begin to restore to the community the values created by the community which are registered in land-values and we shall then have the essential ground plan for all reconstruction.

It was not a Georgeist, but the Financial Editor of the *Manchester Guardian* who wrote: "Far more poverty and hardship could easily be caused by false economic policies after the war than by the war itself". A bold thing to say, and only those who know their Henry George can judge how true it is that, awful as are the afflictions of war, they do not surpass the social miseries and tragedies caused, generation after generation, by the perpetuation of the private monopoly of land. Britain may yet lead the way in lifting this entail of suffering.

Canada's Wartime Economy

By HERBERT T. OWENS

WHEN Canada entered the war, the government declared for a pay-as-you-go policy as far as possible, with the result that federal taxation is much higher than formerly. The average man feels it particularly in the National Defense tax on wages. Single persons earning from \$600 to \$1200 per year pay 2%, and 3% over \$1200. A married person is exempt up to \$1200, but pays 2% if the income exceeds \$1200 per annum, with an allowance of \$8 for each dependent child. The regular income tax has been extended to take in still lower paid groups. For example, before the war, incomes under \$2000 a year for married men were exempt, but the lowest limit now is \$1500. On single incomes, the exemption has been lowered from \$1000 to \$750. Some articles which had formerly been exempt from Federal sales tax were made liable to this tax. Despite all the extra taxes, however, resort has had to be

made to loans, and several large loans have been over-subscribed.

Strenuous efforts are being made to bring into effect a better economic order in Western Canada. It is recognized now that soil was devoted to wheat growing which should never have been so used. Under government auspices, crested wheat grass, originally imported from Russia, is being sown on a large scale. Its deep roots hold the soil and prevent drifting. Settlers are being removed from submarginal lands to better land farther north in Saskatchewan, and nearly 2,000,000 acres have been returned to state ownership in the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Scheme, and these tracts are being used for grazing purposes. Users pay a rental per head of cattle grazed. Extensive irrigation projects are a part of this huge reclamation scheme.

A number of controls have been put into effect as war measures. A new experience for Canadians is foreign exchange control. Canada's purchases from the United States for war purposes are so huge that the balance of trade has run the Canadian dollar down to a value of 89c in American currency. In other words, we have to provide \$1.10 Canadian money to pay for every American dollar's worth that we buy. Trade for other than war munitions and such things as citrus fruits is discouraged. Only Canadians travelling on official business can get funds wherewith to travel in the United States.

Another feature of wartime economy is rent control. The sudden influx of workers into centers like Ottawa, Halifax, Parry Sound, Vancouver, etc., caused rents to skyrocket, and rent profiteering was rampant. This situation was met by the appointment of a Rent Controller, and the pegging of rents as of January 1940. Rental courts have been sitting in numerous centers and their proceedings have enlivened the pages of the newspapers. In Ottawa, at every sitting of the rentals court, landlords and tenants each have a representative on the tribunal, the third member being a judge. It would appear that these courts are not sticking to the letter of the regulation—the decisions seem to be establishing a fair rental—although in the main there is a close adherence to the spirit of the control. The government's announcement of rent control aroused the ire of the Property Owners' Associations, the president of one of the leading groups denouncing the move as "totalitarian control over the destinies of the land-owning people of Canada." The same individual asserted that he didn't believe in any government body trying to exploit the landlord. That runs true to caste.

THE FEUDAL SYSTEM ABOLISHED IN QUEBEC

Once more a Canadian government has shown kindness of the hard cash variety to landlords, such as the British government has shown to the owners of coal mines. By a payment of \$3,200,000 to some 245 seigniories by the government of the Province of Quebec, 60,000 French Canadian

farmers are freed hereafter from the obligation to pay rent to the descendants of the seigneurs who received immense grants of land during the French regime in Canada. The savings to the habitants* will be some \$180,000 a year.

The Quebec Legislature decided on this step at its last session, and so ended a matter which has been contentious for over a century. When the French came to Canada they transplanted the feudal system to New France. Most of the lands bordering the St. Lawrence were granted to seigneurs on condition that they perform military service, bring in settlers, and pay a "quint" to the Crown when the seignery changed hands. The settlers paid a small rental (*cens et rentes*), payable in cash or kind; they had to work for the seigneur about three days a year; and to pay a sum (*lods et ventes*) when the seignory changed owners.

There was not much objection to the seigniorial system until the United Empire Loyalists flocked into Canada from the United States after the Revolutionary War. The British authorities then in control gave the newcomers land grants in free socage, with no rent to pay, and the French habitants felt that they were being rooked in comparison. The coming of the Loyalists also raised seigniorial land values. Resentment simmered as the system began to pinch. An Act of 1825 gave tenants the privilege of commuting tenures where there was mutual agreement as to terms. However, not much change resulted, and one of the causes of the 1837 rebellion was grievances over landownership.

The habitant could also be levied on, be it noted, for tithes by the Church, a right which was freely exercised. In 1854, the Seigniorial Tenures Abolition Act was passed, freeing the habitants from all their obligations except a fixed rent (*rente constituée*), and they could get possession of their land by commuting the rentals in a lump sum payment at 6 per cent. However, very few of the habitants took advantage of the commutation privilege, with the result that the government of Premier Godbout recently brought in the legislation under which the Province of Quebec comes to the rescue of the cultivators and buys out the rights of the seigniorial system at an average figure of \$13,060. Georgeists could have shown a better way.

THE ROWELL-SIROIS COMMISSION

Possibly the most momentous matter now before the Canadian people is contained in the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, called for short by the names of its Chairmen—the Rowell-Sirois Commission. The federal government convened a conference of federal and provincial ministers to deal with them, and sittings began in Ottawa on January 14th. In convening the conference, the Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, intimated that his government thought highly of the recommendations of the Commission.

There is one recommendation made by the Commission which has serious economic implications, and that is the following: "The Dominion, while retaining its unlimited taxing powers, would recognize an obligation to respect the remaining revenue sources of the provinces." The adoption of the foregoing means that the federal authority would make a gentleman's agreement with the provinces whereby it will refrain from levying a federal tax on land values. This would be a needless inhibition. The Dominion should not bind its future. Both our sister Dominions of New Zealand and Australia now include a national land tax in their budgets. Also, had the budget proposals of David Lloyd George and Phillip Snowden gone into effect, Great Britain today would have been financing, in part at least, on a national land value tax. The Sirois Commission's proposal quoted above is a serious defect in its work, and shows lack of familiarity both with basic taxation principles and with what other parts of the British Commonwealth are doing.

Coming to provincial sources of revenue, the Commission apparently sees no economic objection in continuing to tax gasoline gallonage, looking upon this as a natural and normal source of income, and anticipates that it will yield more and more as years go by and highways are improved. It does not recognize or advocate that the abutting land values on provincial highways should be taxed instead of the users of gasoline; and by its silence on that point tacitly assumes that the private appropriation of publicly produced values is in the natural order.

In dealing with municipal sources of revenue, the Commission finds that "real estate" is taxed too highly, and recommends that the burden on property owners be lightened—but not by taking taxes off improvements, a practice of which the Commission never seems to have heard. The report even ignores the practice in Western Canada of exempting improvements in whole or in part. The silence of the Commission on this point reveals either its ignorance or its bias. The orgies of land speculation are ignored in the historical survey, except in the following matter-of-fact footnote: "Defaults by derelict towns resulting from miscalculation as to the economic future have, of course, occurred in many regions throughout Canadian history." Booms, depression and unemployment are regarded as part of the scheme of things. Unemployment is visualized by the Commission as a "permanent factor," to be mitigated as far as possible by unemployment insurance, which has just gone into effect in Canada; also by construction of public works and other more or less makeshift provisions.

In pointing out the evils of our taxation system, the Commission has done a fairly good piece of work; but its recommendations do not touch upon, and will not solve, the economic ills from which the Dominion suffers. The task remains for Georgeists to point out the importance of their reform.

**Habitants* is the name given to the cultivators or farmers who are descendants of the French regime.

France Returns to the Soil

By PAVLOS GIANNELIA

MARSHAL Petain has said: "The only wealth you possess is your labor . . . France will become again what she should never have ceased to be—an essentially agricultural nation. Like the giant of mythology, she will recover all her strength by contact with the soil."

To realize this return to the soil, we meet again the demagogical measures which—because of their appearance of justice and patriotism—have been tried in every country where the leaders have aimed to substitute "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*). Why should these measures, which have failed everywhere else to bring practical results, have more chance of realization in France?

Here are some of the regulations that have been imposed since the proclamation of the new Constitution: The price of wheat is fixed (100 kilograms, 214 francs). The hiring of foreign manual labor is limited. Gangs of young people are being organized to work on farms. Industrial establishments must dismiss workers formerly employed in agriculture, in order that they may be returned to the farms.

In addition to the numerous regulations (there are 700 decrees!) a vast program of public works has been undertaken totalling \$350 millions (18,000 million francs). The program includes draining and irrigation projects, construction of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, 2500 bridges, the setting up of electric power stations and the electrification of the lines Paris-Lyon, Brive-Montauban and Bordeaux-Nimes.

Besides these official decrees, there are many unofficial proposals in the severely censored press. The following, in *Le Progres de l'Allier*, is typical: "There should be no difficulty in providing dwellings. A law, declaring every house deserted for more than five years and every field deserted for more than three years, to be common property and assigned to a new proprietor, would take care of the situation and would not be objectionable." *Paris Soir* has this to offer: "For the clearing of seven million hectares (17½ million acres)—twice the area of the Netherlands—ploughs and man-power are not always enough. A great many fields are arid, and workers should not desert the rich fields to take care of the poor ones. The sheep would make an efficient and gratuitous agricultural worker. After the flock has enriched the soil, the plough can turn it and the sower fertilize it. One shepherd and 500 sheep can do more for the clearing of the soil than ten ploughmen and a trainload of chemicals!"

We could continue to enumerate all the decrees and proposals; but enough has been given to show the spirit that prevails. All these measures are well-intentioned and derive

from the urgent necessity of contending with work stoppage and poverty. A glance at the facts will show the urgency of present conditions. France, which is considered a rich and fertile land, is suffering in a high degree from general depopulation, the density being 200 inhabitants to the square mile. Her neighbors have a much greater density per square mile—360 in Italy, 600 in the Netherlands, 660 in Belgium, and 1130 in Western Germany. Especially serious is the desertion of the rural districts, as illustrated by the following: A village in the fertile plain of Forez had, in 1896, 326 houses and 1250 inhabitants; today it has only 210 houses and 710 inhabitants, the number of cultivators falling from 190 to 136. No wonder the traveller meets everywhere deserted houses and fallow bramble-covered fields! No wonder there are three million square miles to clear!

The facts are undeniable. And the necessity to contend with poverty is also undeniable. But are the proposed measures really adequate? Has there been any attempt to elucidate the causes of France's present woes? Let us point out the objectionable features of some of the decrees and proposals.

When the State fixes the price of wheat, who is paying the difference between the fixed price and the world-market price? How can the taxpayer, charged with this excess over the world-market price, benefit financially?

When an employer hires a foreign worker, it is either because that worker is cheaper than native labor, or because he possesses knowledge and capacities unknown to the native. In either case, the restriction now imposed upon foreign labor brings a rise in the price of commodities, and an extra burden on the consumer. The same is true of the disbanding of industrial workers and their reemployment in former occupations. If the employer needed them, he would hire them without official enforcement. If his business does not need these workers, then the obligation to employ them is a palliative, which will probably result in the bankrupting of many enterprises.

As for the deserted houses and fields—what is the probability that the newcomer will succeed on the soil where the last occupant failed? And certainly the supporter of the sheep proposal is quite right when he says that the rich fields should not be neglected in order to work on the poor fields. (As for this sheep proposal, incidentally—just between us—neither 500 sheep nor one sheep are gratuitous in France!)

I have only suggested the flaws in the present measures. The chief objection is that none of them goes to the root of the difficulty. Before any reform can be attempted, the causes must be examined. There are Georgeists who assert that speculation and the speculative withdrawal of land is

the sole cause of all the evils. As I see it, the burdensome taxes that are now imposed are also causing much of the difficulty.

The land prices alone cannot be responsible for the idleness of the land. The price of agricultural land inside the margin of production averages 3000 francs per hectare (\$30 per acre). Such prices are not so much a hindrance as are the unjust tax burdens imposed on the use of land. The taxes increase relatively in *inverse proportion*, to the income—that is, increasing as the income decreases, thus falling much more heavily on the poor than on the rich. There is a tax of 5% on the under-assessed value of agricultural land, but the salutary effects of this are greatly offset by the huge burden of indirect taxes.

Every French estate today is a living illustration of the discouraging effects of the present taxation methods on production, as emphasized by Henry George: "The manner in which equal amounts of taxation may be imposed may very differently affect the production of wealth . . . Taxation which falls upon labor as it is exerted, wealth as it is used as capital, land as it is cultivated, will manifestly tend to discourage production . . . The present method of taxation operates upon exchange like artificial deserts and mountains. It operates upon energy, and industry, and skill, and thrift, like a fine upon those qualities." Causes other than land speculation led Henry George to formulate his remedy for poverty in the following words: "Abolish all taxation save that upon land values."

There are official decrees in France today that graze the truth. For instance, in October 1940, the government abolished the custom duties on horses, cattle, poultry, meat, dairy products, grain, and many vegetables. In November, the following was decreed: "Inheritances up to half a million francs are totally exempted from taxation, when there are more than two minor children to inherit."

I ask: When the Minister of Finances has acknowledged that custom duties are a handicap to the welfare of the people, why not suppress all the other duties, which have the same effect? If the propriety of abolishing taxes on small inheritances is seen, why not also look to the other taxes, especially the indirect taxes?

In 1940, forty-two million consumers paid 43,800 million francs in indirect taxes, as compared with the 1937 figures of 37,100 millions. The four and a half million taxpayers paid 14,000 millions in direct taxes in 1940, as compared with the 1937 figure of 37,100 millions. Is the increase of 244% in the direct taxes, as compared with the increase of only 18% in the indirect taxes, an indication that the bad effect of indirect taxation has at last been recognized?

One thing is certain: A change for the better cannot be expected unless the government imposes a tax on land value, restoring the real land value, and gradually abolishing all other taxes.

Is It Twilight or Dawn?

By J. L. BJORNER

(From *Grundskyld*, October 1940. Translated by Grace Isabel Colbron.)

FOR those who enjoy their pessimism and embrace their worries, the time we are now living in is a rather good time, and no one should prevent them from being as worried as possible—provided they keep their pessimism for themselves and do not force it on their fellow-mortals. But for folks with a more wholesome point of view, it is good to look our times right in the eyes, to weigh advantage and disadvantage, and try to find some little profit in the accounting.

One thing can be looked on as gain, and that is that we are living in a very interesting epoch—an epoch that can teach us much.

Most people can now see what many Georgeists prophesied—that the Versailles Treaty was a bad mistake. The new boundaries drawn up in Versailles may in some cases have been better than the old ones in that they paid more heed to language and ethnographical boundaries, and the League of Nations was a step in the right direction. But the demand of the Entente Powers (especially France), that the more than two thousand miles of new borders should be *tariff* borders, tore the Versailles Peace in tatters. Tariff is war—and war always results from it. This was one of the causes why Germany, for instance, and also England, were cheated in the disarmament issue; but it was the tariff which the munitions industry knew how to play as their trump card. That is how we can best summarize the position of today. And what now?

The war in Western Europe may be looked upon as over, for the moment. But can it not extend itself still further towards the West? Most certainly. There is space enough for a Thirty-Years' War for the sovereignty of the Atlantic Ocean, and still further—but that is probably too big a mouthful for the war industries. And the people themselves may become weary of the war. The strongest probability is that the war will cease in a relatively near future. And then we'll have "peace"! Nothing more?

"Peace is not the best thing one could wish for." We should not struggle merely to keep peace. There's peace in the churchyard, the peace of the grave. Life cannot be supported on peace alone. The opposite of war is not merely peace, but co-operation, just as helping one another is the opposite to killing one other. Not just peace, but free trade, is the true opposite of war. Down with the barriers, then—which means, down with the tariff!

What are the chances?

After France's collapse the government of Marshal Petain sent out the word: "France's recovery will come

through a new economic system in commerce and agriculture, and industry shall learn to keep itself up by the quality of its production." In other words; away with Protection . . . institute free economy!

And Germany? Alfred Rosenberg, on July 10th, called together the foreign press to give them a glimpse of Germany's future economic policy. Rosenberg pictured a Europe of independent States but without customs frontiers! And as there was some doubt later as to what he really had said, two important dailies, the *Berliner Boersenzeitung* on July 13th, and the *Volkischer Beobachter* on July 16th, carried long commentaries on Rosenberg's speech and ended with the following words, dealing especially with the North; "Germany does not intend to pull down the Northern States, whose rich cultural wealth and historical tradition are perhaps nowhere in the world better known than in Germany. Living and working together, that is Germany's aim, not destruction of historical values."

But—how much understanding has modern Germany about free trade? That is another question. Opinions differ in Germany, differ widely. Recently, Germany's plans for a future political ordering of German agriculture were announced. The Government seems to see clearly regarding the danger of the constant capitalization of ground rents and its attendant increase of price and consequent indebtedness of land property. But instead of meeting this problem with an effective land valuation tax, they are merely instituting any number of new regulations, old regulations and the like—regulations that are the opposite of free trade.

But that is Germany's concern. But they must let the rest of us practise free trade.

It is high time that we gather our forces for a forward push. We had all the necessary conditions for making Denmark Europe's free port—to our own advantage and as an instructive example to other countries. But we did not do it. Much might have looked better for us, but the majority willed it otherwise. Now, we've got our "cold shower." Let us hope that it will teach us to open our eyes and come together for a new strong policy.

What Lloyd George said in the House of Commons last May was quite true—that England and France had only themselves to thank for Hitler's hard hand over them. And we can say that we have only ourselves to thank for much in our public policies.

Much has happened this year which may portend a new healthy popular uprising. We have seen the five democratic parties (in Denmark) unite in a concerted opposition to reaction. We have seen employers and workers unite to avoid future wages disputes. That is an important step! And many things point to a new awakening of national life. There were the 740,000 people who met on September 1st to sing the Grundtvig song. That could not

have happened a year ago! And the feeling of fellowship that lay over the dedication of the Grundtvig Church on September 8th—Grundtvig's Church—the great work of a faithful disciple of Henry George, Architect Jensen Klint . . . a landmark to the talent of our day. And on the latest occasion, September 26th, our King's 70th birthday, the wave of homage and fidelity that rolled out toward the King had an objective higher than the King's person. It was the cry of a people to Heaven, the cry of a strongly felt national unity. "We are Danes—and we will always be Danes."

Will the Denmark of Valdemar's day—the Denmark of free trade and of the great land reformers—blossom again in a new national Spring towards the aim of The Earth for the People?

Does our day mean Twilight or Dawn?

It is Dawn!

Announcement

We are informed by Mr. Arthur Madsen, editor of *Land & Liberty*, of the British Postmaster-General's announcement that letter and parcel mails containing correspondence and parcels posted in the United States of America approximately between October 17th and 22nd, November 4th and 14th, and November 18th and December 6th, have been lost through enemy action. The mails included some correspondence from Central America posted on correspondingly earlier periods.

If any friends have written to the United Committee or the International Union, or *Land & Liberty* at 34 Knight-rider Street, London, E. C. 4, and have not had expected replies, they should communicate again.

Land & Liberty is published regularly, month by month, and any of its readers missing any copy should write at once to *Land & Liberty*.

Legislative Framework

Readers will note in this issue a special supplement (Section 2), "A Legislative Framework for the Philosophy of Henry George." This work is the result of long and careful research, and we would earnestly suggest its study by our readers. It would be highly desirable to convey the plan to others, particularly to legislators and governmental officers. If any further information is desired, communicate with the American Association for Scientific Taxation, care of LAND AND FREEDOM.

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

Signs of Progress

GEORGEIST ACTIVITIES THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

REPORT OF V. G. PETERSON, SECRETARY

We were pleased with the good reception given our 1941 calendar. Almost everyone liked it and stories of its effectiveness are still coming in. One friend reported the other day that a minister to whom she gave a calendar chose one of its quotations as the text of his Sunday sermon. Another person came in to purchase one after seeing it hanging in the executive office of a well-known organization. A prominent New Jersey manufacturer liked it so well that he purchased a quantity and sent them out to customers and business associates. Thus, a little over a thousand calendars have been distributed. We still have a few left and shall be glad of any help we can get in putting these into circulation.

Four hundred and fifty books went out as a result of our campaign to have Henry George's books given as Christmas presents. This is work in which all Georgeists can participate to some degree, and we have ample testimony as to its effectiveness. To cite one of the innumerable cases: The other day an order came for a full set of books from a man who had been given a Henry George book in 1939. He said, in an accompanying letter, "I intend to make a full study of the interesting philosophy to which my friend so kindly introduced me."

We also want to thank the scores of friends who remembered the Foundation with greeting cards and letters this Christmas season. From far and near these greetings came, some from Australia, some from embattled London, and one from South Africa.

You will be interested to know that just this week we received a long letter from Mr. Arthur Madsen of the Henry George Foundation of Great Britain. Mr. Madsen tells us that the Foundation is carrying on as usual, with all members of the staff on the job every day. He and Mrs. Madsen have gone to Scotland for a few months so that he may complete some important work without interruption.

Last autumn we experimented with a new piece of advertising literature designed to help our bookdealers sell "Progress and Poverty." The cover of this attractive booklet asks the provocative question, "How High is Your E. I. Q?" ("Economics Intelligence Quotient," in case you have not guessed it.) Taking its cue from the popular quiz programs which come to us nightly over the air, our booklet challenges the reader with ten questions on economics starting with, "Where do wages come from," and leading up to

the more controversial question, "Can combinations of workmen increase the general level of wages?" The answers to these questions are also given in the booklet so that the reader may test his knowledge and then grade his own intelligence regarding economics. The intention is that he will thus become so interested in Henry George's point of view that he will hurry back to the store to buy the book. Each bookdealer who agrees to let the booklet work for him is sent a supply with his name and address printed inside. Several repeat orders received in the last two weeks encourage us to believe that the booklet is accomplishing its purpose. If you would like to see this booklet, send us a penny post-card and we will put one in the mail for you.

Princeton University placed an order this week for a quantity of "Progress and Poverty," which is required reading in their economics course. As one of the faculty once told us, "A man hasn't much chance of graduating from Princeton without knowing something about Henry George." It is also interesting to recall that the death mask of Henry George, cast in bronze, rests in Princeton's famous collection of death masks of the World's Great. This mask was unveiled by Mrs. de Mille in impressive ceremonies a few years ago.

Considerable interest has been manifested in Franz Oppenheimer's famous book, "The State," but it was only recently that we discovered that a few hundred copies of this classic are still available. The organic history of the State has been rendered dull by most learned accounts of it and, in sharp contrast, Dr. Oppenheimer's story is fascinating reading from start to finish. Many printings of this book have been made in this country, for its important information, written in easily readable style, has made it highly acceptable to American readers. The edition we have access to is 75c a copy, bound in cloth.

Much of our time is being devoted to the normal schools throughout the country. Our test campaign, conducted last autumn, revealed this group as more responsive than the average list. The value of reaching these budding teachers cannot be exaggerated, for if they can be made to comprehend the importance of Henry George in the fields of economics and philosophy, that influence may eventually be demonstrated in the classrooms of our public and high schools.

Henry George School of Social Science HEADQUARTERS

Commencement exercises for the 700 Fall term graduates were held at the Engineers Auditorium, January 13.

In addition to student speakers, and an address by Mr. Frank Chodorov, Director, the program included these novel features: A quiz contest on "Georgiana"; a skit, "Baby Snooks and the Law of Rent," written by Edwin Ross, and enacted by Mr. Ross and Miss Dorothy Sara; a demonstration of a unique mechanical contrivance elucidating the Law of Rent, invented and built by Mr. Emanuel Ebner; and a sale of Henry George School pins, introduced by an auction of the first pin, with Mr. Arthur Landry as auctioneer. About 750 attended this occasion. Mr. Otto K. Dorn was chairman.

The new semester opened the week of January 27, with a total enrollment, to date, of 1600. Of these, 1100 are taking the basic course in Fundamental Economics, including 100 high school students, and 500 have enrolled for the various advanced courses. The Leaflet Distribution Committee is in no small degree responsible for this figure. The basic course has been changed from a ten-week to a fifteen-week course. On this new schedule, "Protection or Free Trade" will consume the latter five weeks, the first ten weeks being taken up with "Progress and Poverty," as before.

Two important lecture courses have been added to the curriculum. One is on the "Principles of Assessing," a series of seven weekly lectures which began Tuesday, January 14. This series is conducted by Mr. John St. George of the New York City Tax Department. The course provides a much-needed familiarity with the fiscal fundamentals of taxation, with special reference to the system and methods employed by the New York City Department of Taxes. This course has been well attended. The second lecture course is on "The Influence of Henry George on Economics," a series of five weekly lectures beginning January 31, and conducted by Mr. Morris Forkosch.

The Fall term elective advanced courses have drawn to a close, with Mr. Michael Bernstein's course on "Democracy versus Socialism" taking the lead in popularity. In this course, Mr. Bernstein uses Max Hirsch's celebrated book which gives the course its name. Other courses are: Social Philosophy, based upon Dr. George R. Geiger's "The Philosophy of Henry George"; Public Speaking; Basic Principles of Composition; Formal Logic. Robert Clancy has completed a ten-week course on the Life and Teachings of Oscar H. Geiger, the Founder and first Director of the Henry George School of Social Science. In this course, the background of the School is discussed. Geiger's philosophy of life is also studied. His philosophy, while based upon Henry George, also presents many original features, such as his views on Natural Law, the Unity of Creation, and Individual Ethics.

CHICAGO, ILL.

The largest Winter term in the history of the Chicago Henry George School opened the week of January 13 with 33 classes in "Progress and Poverty," and 16 advanced classes. The total enrollment was nearly 500. In addition, over 300 inquiries concerning the correspondence course were received. The campaign for students was marked by the distribution of 40,000 announcements, 2000 posters, and news releases which appeared in 60 metropolitan and neighborhood or suburban papers. Forty teachers are manning the new classes, seven doing double duty, and one triple duty.

In other ways the Chicago School is progressing. A library has been started, augmented by a donation of many Georgeist books and a bust of Henry George. The Chicago Speakers Bureau, well past the "wing-testing" stage, is increasing its engagements. "America's Forgotten Line of Defense" is proving a talk of particularly popular appeal. Mr. Francis Neilson is sponsoring a letter contest open to recent graduates of the Chicago School.

And so the Windy City moves apace.

The School of Democracy

Mr. Harry J. Haase, who is engaged in a Georgeist educational program in the School of Democracy, has submitted a four-point proposal for a Georgeist course of action, which he calls "A Four-Year Plan". The plan follows:

1—That we spend the next three years educating—utilizing all our resources to imbue every person we can reach with the philosophy of freedom.

2—That, having obtained an individual's acceptance of the Georgeist philosophy of freedom, we see to it that no individual drops out of the struggle of "freedom through enlightenment."

3—That we hold a convention at the end of the third year of this program, and adopt a platform of freedom to be submitted to every candidate for a major state or national office (all parties).

4—That we follow up each and every one of these candidates, and demand that he take a stand on our platform—for or against.

Suggestion No. 1 is offered to all schools, organizations and groups teaching the collection of economic rent as the remedy for society's ills, regardless of method, text or teacher. It is also intended for those who educate through lectures, publications, radio talks, or any other method.

Point No. 2 means that some method of utilizing the energy of everyone who accepts the philosophy of freedom should be found. The "method" should be broad enough to take consideration of every individual. There should be provision for those who want to teach formally in the classroom; for those who want to carry the message "outside";

for those who want to organize. In short, we should attempt to use everybody's talents in a way most satisfactory to the individual.

On point No. 3—All who have been active in the work of spreading knowledge of the true basis of freedom ought to submit suggestions for the platform. The convention might be held at the time of the Annual Henry George Congress, and take up an additional session.

The fourth step can be taken whenever and wherever candidates speak in public. It can be done by personal calls, through the mails, or in the columns of the press.

Instead of forming a third party and trying to fight the strong political machines, the above program will enable us to utilize the strong parties to accomplish our purpose. It will make it possible for the people to demand of the politicians what they want, instead of supinely accepting a choice between party-made variations of our present unsound system. It will make it possible for the people to have a *real* choice at the polls for the first time in our national history.

The author of the above program would be interested in receiving comments on his ideas. Address Harry J. Haase, the School of Democracy, 1165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

American Alliance to Advance Freedom

A group of Georgeists have been meeting during the past few weeks for the purpose of launching an organization that will bring Henry George's proposals to the forefront "in the councils of world affairs." Calling itself the American Alliance to Advance Freedom (with the subtitle, "By Promoting the Principle of Natural Economic Rights"), this organization plans to issue pamphlets, conduct current events forums, and engage in related activities. The following aims have been formulated: 1—To awaken interest among non-Georgeists in the Georgeist doctrines, so that many whose curiosity is thus aroused will seek formal instruction. 2—To crystallize Georgeism in terms of specific goals in order to offer concrete objectives for men and women seeking a way out of the present social and economic crisis. 3—To bring the issue of Georgeism before legislative bodies throughout the country in order that the principles of equal right to the use of land and free trade will be adopted as the basis for making the coming peace a permanent and a just one.

The Chairman of the Alliance is Sidney J. Abelson, the Secretary is Elbert Josefson, and the Financial Secretary, Sara Wald. The Provisional Committee consists of Lloyd Buchman, Miles Shefferman, Roberty Clancy, Gilbert M. Tucker, Erna L. Nash, and Malcolm R. White.

The Alliance is issuing a "Proposal for Georgeist Action Now," to be submitted to followers of Henry George. Herewith are selected passages:

"What stands out in the life of Henry George, in his life as an author and his life as an active man of affairs, is his belief in immediate social reform and his faith that vigorous, zealous action could make that reform a reality.

"We side with Henry George in his belief and in this vision.

"The cry for bread and peace issues from the throats of nearly two billion human beings. Who can answer this call?

"So-called 'capitalism' (a misnomer for our monopoly system), Socialism, Communism, Nazism, Fascism, each in turn had its day and failed. There is no answer to be found in any of these.

"With each passing day the cry becomes deeper and more desperate. The organism we call society does not and cannot stand still.

"We believe that the doctrines of Henry George answer this call for a new way of life that will bring peace and prosperity through justice. We believe that the two billion human beings now inhabiting this planet, however indifferent they might have been to us before the various "isms" were tried and found wanting, are now hungry for the very doctrines we have to offer, and that they will listen to us if we speak up.

"We believe that our time, the time of a Georgeist emergence into the councils of world affairs, is at hand."

The Alliance has also issued a "Declaration of Principles." The complete Proposal, the Declaration, application for membership, or any other information, may be obtained by writing to the American Alliance to Advance Freedom, 22 West 48th Street, Suite 505, New York, N. Y.

Women's Single Tax Club of Washington

REPORT OF GERTRUDE E. MACKENZIE

The December and January meetings of the Club have been devoted to ways and means of promulgating the Single Tax gospel, as well as to the regular business of the Club.

At the meeting held December 2, the general subject for discussion was education, based upon the book being studied by the Washington Federation of Women's Clubs, entitled "The Purpose of Education in American Democracy," compiled by the Educational Policies Commission. The Federation speakers of the evening were: Mrs. Arthur C. Watkins, Chairman, Department of Education; Mrs. Charles H. Pierce, Vice Chairman, Department of Education; and Miss Mary E. Downey, Chairman, Committee on Public Safety. Among the other speakers was Mr. Matthew Ramage, a school teacher of many years' experience, who gave examples of the methods used by him to make school courses interesting; he explained that the secret of learning was learning how to learn. Mrs. Walter N. Campbell spoke on the true purpose of teaching—which she considered to

be enabling people to think clearly for themselves, mathematical training being particularly useful to gain this end. After some discussion it was suggested that the Washington Federation of Women's Clubs take up the study of "Progress and Poverty," after completing the present work.

At the January meeting, the speaker was Mrs. Barbara Crosser Sweeney, who gave an interesting and instructive talk on organization and also on methods of individual work in spreading the Single Tax gospel. In response to the question as to why Mr. Robert Crosser was the only Georgeist left in Congress, some of the methods used to defeat our other Representatives were explained. Mr. Walter I. Swanton presented an interesting account of the Single Tax, where it is advocated and where applied.

Great Britain

At its quarterly meeting, toward the close of 1940, the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, made plans for organizing its work for 1941. It is interesting to note that the scope of activities for the coming year are not to be less than it has been during 1940. The maintenance of the Committee's journal, *Land & Liberty*, is provided for, monthly, at its present number of pages (12), and for a surplus supply available for propaganda uses. Distribution of the journal has already given evidence that it is an effective means of propaganda.

At the headquarters of the Committee and of *Land & Liberty*, in London, is also housed an international Georgeist body known as the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade. There are members of this Union in every part of the globe. At this time particularly, such an organization, devoted to the building up of international good will among workers in the Georgeist cause, is most valuable. Membership is open to all who embrace the Georgeist doctrines. The small sum of \$2.00 will bring a year's membership in the International Union and a year's subscription to *Land & Liberty*. (Larger donations are, of course, welcome.) Application for membership may be obtained by addressing the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, 34 Knightrider Street, St. Paul's, London, England.

St. Paul's, incidentally, is in the heart of London, where extensive bombing raids have been carried out by the enemy. It is gratifying to report, however, that the office of the United Committee has escaped damage, even during the severe City of London fires of December 29th. The quality of *Land & Liberty*, too, has remained unimpaired. The January 1941 issue is especially interesting. It carries many informative accounts of the current situation in Britain as related to the Georgeist proposal.

There is also the first installment of an article on the land question in Germany, by Bruno Heilig, entitled, "The Land Question Germany's Dominating Factor." Mr. Heilig was

the Balkan correspondent of the Berlin *Vossische Zeitung*, 1920-1928. He was expelled from Hungary for his criticism of the landowners' reactionary system. In his *Land & Liberty* article, Mr. Heilig asserts that Henry George's "How Modern Civilization May Decline," if written in the present tense, would be a description of Germany today. He traces land speculation as the chief cause of Germany's woes which led to the rise of Hitler. During the post-war reconstruction days, "land speculators had a fantastic time, some doubling and trebling their fortunes overnight. While the common people toiled feverishly and proudly to build up the new Germany that should be the world's most advanced community, money poured into the pockets of those who gambled in land values . . . The boom had lasted some seven years, and it ended with seven million men and women, one-third of the wage-earning people, rendered unemployed, and the middle class as a recognizable section swept away."

January 20

THIS date, even prior to 1941, is memorable in history. It is peculiarly the date of both life and death with reference to democracy as a mode of government. For it was January 20, in the year 1265, which brought to life the first English Parliament. Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, after overthrowing Henry III, promulgated a Constitution, and called forth representatives from shires and boroughs to meet in Westminster Palace. Then and there were effected the rudimentary beginnings of the present-day bicameral Parliament in England.

Again on this date, in the year 1793, Louis XVI listened in silence to the reading of his death sentence. The guillotine thus marked the end of the throne of the Bourbons and the birth of a French democracy.

On this very same day, in the year 1941, of controversial significance to democracy, Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated as the first third-term President of the United States of America. Thus was a tradition terminated which had successfully withstood attack since the birth of the American Republic.

It is intriguing to suppose that January 20 was chosen as Inaugural Day because of its historic significance. But this is not the case—the date was arrived at by a compromise. When the Twentieth Amendment to the Constitution was proposed in Congress, January 15 was the date fixed by the House of Representatives. The Senate voted for January 24. The Committees of both Houses met to adjust their differences, and by the simple expedient of splitting the dates, arrived at January 20 as Inauguration Day.

In the light of democracy's historic events, no more significant date could have been selected.

The Interest Question An Australian Comment

By A. G. HUIE

FOR years the wrangling over interest has had a hamstringing effect upon efforts to spread a knowledge of Henry George's principles among the people. It is all the more difficult to understand Mr. Gaston Haxo's attitude following his admissions in the opening paragraphs of his article, "A Theory of Interest", in the July-August 1940 issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*.

He admits (1) that the interest question has been the subject of discussion for many centuries without reaching agreement; and (2) that today interest is more firmly established than ever. It is under these conditions that he adds to the dissension among those who feel that land rent should be shared by the people and that taxes upon labor should be abolished.

A man may be quite a good George propagandist but someone whispers to him that George was wrong on the interest question. It is plausibly put up that there are other unearned increments apart from those arising in land. So a promising man goes astray, no good to the cause, only a faultfinding critic, and really helping the land monopoly which he claims to oppose.

It seems to me that the attack upon George's views upon interest is really based upon Marx's confusion of land with capital. No man ever did the workers of the world greater disservice than Karl Marx. He gave them a wrong outlook. Unless you have a clear understanding of (1) what constitutes the resources of nature provided free for the use of men, called in economic terms "land", and (2) what is capital, i.e., wealth used to aid production, you are liable to go astray on the question of interest.

Anyone possessing a sense of justice recognizes that labor is entitled to all that it produces. In order that it may do so, equal right of access to the resources of nature is the first essential. The second is that the earnings of labor shall not be subject to any deductions because of taxes imposed by Governments or through special privileges granted to vested interests.

Now Mr. Haxo appears to have failed to understand the logical effect of putting George's proposals into practice. The sources of unearned incomes would be dried up. His assumption, therefore, that a man and his children after him indefinitely could live without working is ill-founded. The income that they get comes from the use of land in some form which is now held to return ground rent to the owner. Such conditions would not exist with ground rent as the natural revenue of society. The capital associated with such land has but a limited life.

Mr. Haxo asserts that the premise that nature gives an increase to capital apart from the return to labor is false. Very well, then, what would be the return to labor without the use of capital? Is it not clear that the use of capital results in an economic advantage to labor? If that advantage is to be enjoyed only by the labor that uses the capital, is it not at the expense of the labor that produces the capital?

The object of production is the satisfaction of human wants. The element of time explains why there is an increase due to capital apart from labor. Capital rightly understood is always a labor product. If the maker of any form of capital uses it himself he enjoys the economic advantages which its use enables him to gain. If he uses capital that another's labor has produced he can only enjoy the economic advantages due to its use at the expense of the labor producing the capital unless he pays interest.

Labor does not produce capital for the sake of allowing other labor to be enriched. If that were so then the mainspring of hu-

man action, that men seek to gratify their desires with the least exertion, is also false and economic science rests on a foundation of sand.

That Mr. Haxo has failed to appreciate the effects of applying George's principles is seen where he asserts that the forces of nature outside man himself which increase the productiveness of labor "will accrue, not to capital or labor, but to monopoly in the form of extraordinary profits or in the form of rent," adding, "if this principle is economically sound."

Yes, "if." But there would be no extraordinary profits or rents to monopolists with George's principles in force so that both producers and consumers would share the economic advantages of labor exerted in production, whether that labor was in the accumulated form of capital or in the working form of labor.

After quoting the definition of capital Mr. Haxo proceeds to ask a question: "We are confronted with the task of determining how much of the produce shall go to capital in interest and how much shall go to labor in wages. Justice demands that each shall receive what it produces, but what has capital produced?" If there were no increase accruing from the use of capital, the answer would be, that capital should receive nothing. The assumption, however, is an absurdity.

Production is carried on by labor, but labor is in two forms, passive in the shape of capital and active in the shape of human effort. If the former had no productive power, as asserted, the latter could do without it. Any practical man knows that the passive form of labor, which we call capital, confers upon the user economic advantages in addition to those due to the active form of human exertion. For that reason men are willing to pay interest, because paying it means more to them than they could earn without paying it.

For the same reason men are willing to pay rent for land above the margin of production. As Patrick Edward Dove put it, "The land produces, according to the law of the Creator, more than the value of the labor expended on it and on this account men are willing to pay a rent for land."

In the same way men are willing to pay for the use of capital because of the increase in results to them. Interest then, is as inevitable and unavoidable as rent. All that we can do is to see that those who are rightly entitled to both interest and rent shall receive them.

The attitude of Mr. Haxo towards capital is of the hair-splitting type, which is of no value if we are to regard George's proposals as practical and capable of realization. He denies that capital is a factor of production but asserts that it is an instrumentality of labor—quite a fine distinction. He is at pains to assert that capital itself produces nothing, and is not entitled to any part of the product. If that is so, then labor could do without it. The practical man knows better. He is not deceived by the finesse of the hair-splitter.

Let me give an example. A party of prospectors discover a good mineral deposit. To develop it so that they can get wages out of it, capital is a vital necessity. They have not got the capital. Without it they are powerless and the riches in the land are no good to them or anyone else.

But other men have the necessary capital which labor had produced. So a bargain is struck. Capital is provided, the mine is developed, and it becomes profitable to the labor that works it, to the labor that has provided the capital and to the community generally.

But Mr. Haxo asks, What has this thing called capital produced? He says that it "has no productive power" and that of "itself produces nothing". All the natural riches of the earth produce nothing, in the same sense, until labor is applied. The earth is as

inanimate as "this thing called capital" until man puts forth his hand—his labor power—to gather fruits, catch fish, snare animals, or do anything else towards satisfying even primitive needs.

If we Georgeists are to accomplish anything worthwhile we must be practical instead of being merely doctrinaires. In putting forward his proposals, Henry George was practical. He recognized that rent was an inevitable payment where competition set up a demand for the opportunity to use land. Rent, therefore, should be shared by the people through being used to provide public works and services. He also recognized that capital was essential in the production and exchange of wealth. He did not refer to it contemptuously as "this thing called capital" and he did not deny that it was a factor in production. He saw that there was an increase in wealth production because of its use apart from rent to land and wages to labor, and that payment because of that increase was both just and inevitable. What that interest will be is determined in the same way as rent for the right to use land and wages to the laborer—by the natural law of competition.

In his efforts to justify his attitude Mr. Haxo appears to me to reach the limit of absurdity. He says that it is just as natural for a laborer to have capital to work with as it is for a buffalo to have horns or for a tiger to have claws. The horns of a buffalo and the claws of a tiger are essential parts of those animals. A man's finger nails are also parts of a man. Capital is not part of a man. It has to be produced by the application of man's labor power to the raw materials of the earth. To the extent that a man produces tools, for example, they are his and he is entitled to the economic advantages which they enable him to gain.

That is clear, but the point at issue is where others produce the tools that a man needs to use. Suppose a man buys tools or a machine or any other article properly defined by George as capital. What is he paying for? Not merely for the labor of making it but rent and interest also. Under present conditions all parties also pay taxes in addition.

But instead of paying the interest when he buys the goods he acquires their use on loan. There are no horns or claws about that. He gets the economic advantages due to the use of the capital he has borrowed, produced by other labor and he pays for it. If he did not pay for it he would be loafing on the labor that produced that capital.

Proceeding to discuss the nature of interest Mr. Haxo indulges in some more hair-splitting in his efforts to show that land and labor only should be considered in the distribution of wealth. Let it be understood that I am not an advocate of the interests of capital. I simply recognize inescapable facts.

Anyone using his own capital reaps such economic advantage as it is capable of yielding. Mr. Haxo asserts that the producer who uses his own capital is not concerned as to the amount of that advantage. Nevertheless, he would be seriously concerned if he did not get it.

It is only when the capital is borrowed that objection is raised to the payment of interest. That is a common objection held by socialists, communists and an assortment of money cranks.

No doubt borrowing is greatly promoted by the private ownership of land, for it severely restricts labor's field of operations and undoubtedly prevents many men from accumulating and using their own capital. That, however, has no bearing upon the inevitable payment of interest.

It is an effect of that basic monopoly of the earth which is the foundation source of economic evils. The original and primary factors of production are land and labor. In modern production, however, there arises the need for an additional force which is indispensable if land is to be made to yield what labor needs.

Trying to dismiss it with contempt as "this thing called capital" and denying that it is a factor in modern production shows failure to face practical realities and failure to concentrate on eliminating the primary evil of monopoly of natural resources which has led to so much borrowing of capital when under natural conditions it would be reduced to a minimum.

It is asserted "those who need capital goods buy them from those who produce them and whose return is therefore wages and not interest." What of the business man who carries on so as to avoid insolvency and prices his goods so as to cover wages? It is a recognized principle of business that you must have a return upon the capital utilized in order to succeed. The purchaser of the printing plant, therefore, pays interest when he buys it and if he is to successfully carry on business he must include it in the prices he charges for his printing.

We come now to the assertion that it is money or its equivalent—purchasing power—that is borrowed. It is followed by this remarkable statement, "If actual capital were borrowed we would have an independent rate of interest for each form of capital." The man who was growing wheat, for example, would have to pay a different rate of interest for the capital he had to borrow than the man who was keeping sheep or another who was making machinery. It is not really money that is borrowed, but wealth expressed in money terms. For if the wealth were not in existence a loan would be impossible.

This attempt to make a distinction between the borrowing of wealth and wealth expressed in money terms is one of the commonest and most fallacious errors of our time. It leads to many fantastic and impractical proposals put forward by men who fail to go down to the root causes of social injustice. They see the effects, which they deplore, and mistaking money and currency for wealth, propose to manipulate them to make conditions better.

So Mr. Haxo reaches the conclusion that the return for money lending—interest—is an unearned increment. That, however, is based upon the fallacy that it is money that is borrowed—not wealth that the money represents. Let us again try to get back to practical realities. A man is acquiring a shop or a small factory. He has part of the means to pay for it, say half, which he is willing to pay down. He must then get a loan upon such terms as may be agreed upon. It is paid over in money by an individual, a firm, or a bank.

But how does the lender find himself in a position to make that loan? Only because of wealth produced and accumulated. What he does is to transfer the right to use it expressed in money terms. It is not money that the borrower wants and pays interest for, but the right to use a certain amount of wealth belonging to others.

Now we come to the conclusion which in my opinion disposes of the attack made upon George's explanation of the cause of interest. Asking the question, is interest equitable, Mr. Haxo answers it in these words: "This depends on whether we are considering interest as a private business transaction or as an institution. The former is equitable because it is a contract freely entered into by two parties". Then he goes on to say that the latter is inequitable because it is forced upon the people as a result of social and economic injustice. Thus we have a clear admission that where interest payments are said to be inequitable it is an effect, not a cause, of social injustice.

So that instead of arguing about interest, the real work is to arouse the people as to the primary causes of poverty in a world where labor is becoming more efficient and wealth is increasing.

The distinction between interest as a private transaction and as an institution seems to me to be purely artificial. It is true that public debts would tend to disappear and that much borrowing would

(Continued on page 34)

BOOK REVIEWS

VOX CLAMANTIS IN DESERTA

"The Tragedy of Europe," by Francis Neilson. C. C. Nelson, Appleton, Wisc., 1940. 680 pp. Limited first edition, \$10.00.

From time immemorial, war has hung about the world like the dead albatross on the back of the Ancient Mariner, and in "The Tragedy of Europe," Francis Neilson has undertaken the super-human task of dissecting its causes and placing the blame for the present conflict.

Few writers are as well equipped for the job at hand. From a ring-side seat in the House of Commons he witnessed the diplomatic maneuvers which ushered in World War No. 1. What he saw he published in a scathing indictment entitled, "How Diplomats Make War." Five large printings of this book have been made and foreign translations have carried it into Germany, France and Sweden. In the intervening years Mr. Neilson has continued his study of international politics, and the present volume is the fruit of that consecration. To it, and to the indomitable courage with which he has expressed his views, Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago pays tribute in his introduction to this remarkable book.

In a day-by-day commentary on military, diplomatic and political events from September 1939 to the invasion of Greece in the following year, the author has traced the cataclysm of affairs in Europe and their effect in the United States.

Mr. Neilson recognizes that the object of war is territorial aggrandizement, but his purpose in this book is primarily that of finding out to whom the guilt of making war belongs. Quoting *The Times* (London) of 1912, he says:

"The answer is to be found in the chancelleries of Europe, among the men who have too long played with human lives as pawns in a game of chess, who have become so emeshed in formulas and the jargon of diplomacy that they have ceased to be conscious of the poignant realities with which they trifle. . ."

Long before Munich, Mr. Neilson recognized the superior strength of Germany. Nor was he ever deluded with the idea that once his bluff was called Hitler would collapse like a pricked balloon. He believes that the old system of the balance of power will have to go, and Great Britain and France must realize and express a willingness to become partners with the other states in a new European system.

It is not in Hitler, but in Stalin, that Mr. Neilson discerns the real world menace. He says, "The exhaustless energy of Stalin has been spent in raising an illiterate thief and cut-throat to an eminence Ivan the Terrible would have hesitated to occupy. . . It is because our interventionists have their binoculars fixed upon the wrong man that they are oblivious to the greatest menace of all; the one which is watching and waiting for the moment to leap—the menace that lies between the Dniester and the Urals."

Mr. Neilson does not believe the defeat of Britain would be followed by an invasion of this Continent within this generation. Further than that he has wisely refrained from making any prediction. His opinion is that a victorious Hitler would be far too occupied with the tasks of his success to be able to undertake an enterprise of such magnitude.

Like a voice crying in the wilderness, "The Tragedy of Europe" will not find easy acceptance. It advances an unpopular view of the war, and the radio and the daily press have successfully inoculated us against its practical iconoclasm. But the voice will not go unheard. As President Hutchins says in his excellent introduction, "Mr. Neilson is entitled to speak. . . and at this hour, when

the fate of all the world is at stake, opinions opposite to those of the majority deserve the most careful attention. Our country will shortly be faced by the decision for peace or war. In reaching that decision we must take into consideration the conclusions reached by the author of this book."

V. G. PETERSON

TWO NEW OFFERINGS OF JOSIAH WEDGWOOD

By recent mail have come two books from England by the Rt. Hon. Josiah C. Wedgwood, D.S.O., M.P.

The one, "Memoirs of a Fighting Life," is an autobiography—an enormously informative work, which gives an intimate backstage picture of British political affairs and shows its author in the role of Commander in the Navy, Colonel in the Army (doing active service in both), Commissioner to South Africa, India and Palestine—and for thirty-five years, a Member of Parliament.

Through the whole chronicle runs a hopeful theme—Col. Wedgwood's complete dedication to the philosophy of Henry George. It is written with a scholarly and brilliant pen, dipped more than occasionally into delicious humor. The book, unfortunately, is not yet for sale in the United States, but a demand for it should be started by Georgeists all over the country, not only because of its admirable contribution to modern history, but because of its propaganda value.

The second book by Col. Wedgwood (in collaboration with Allen Nevins, professor of history at Columbia University) is entitled "Forever Freedom." It is an anthology of great statements made down the centuries, on Liberty. Four pages are given to quotations from Henry George. And under the only picture in the book, a portrait of Col. Wedgwood, is his statement that "the main desire of his life is to get England to adopt the philosophy and taxation of Henry George." This admirable anthology (published by Penguin Books, price 25c) is something to be studied by young and old alike (particularly by benighted anti-Georgeists!). It is apropos of the moment, and yet timeless.

ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE

PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

Mr. Don L. Thompson has written and published a number of pamphlets on different phases of the economic problem. Among them are: "Legislating Prosperity for the Farmer, and the Back-to-the-Farm Panacea", "Our Deluded Over-Productionists—Not Over-Production but Under-Production", "The Problem of Unemployment", and "The Great Economic Delusion—an Answer to the Townsend Pension Plan." Mr. Thompson deals with fundamental economics, and many current fallacies are effectively answered in these pamphlets. Information pertaining to them may be had by writing to Mr. Don L. Thompson, E 2527 Illinois Avenue, Spokane, Wash.

A new and attractive edition of John Salmon's pamphlet, "American Taxation," has been published by the School of Democracy. In his preface, Mr. Salmon says: "Astonishing confusion of thought prevails on the subject of taxation. It's not so complicated as some writers make it. Our effort is made herewith to present it simply, hoping to have readers realize the need for a change more in conformity with American ideals." In the booklet, the Georgeist view on taxation is concisely presented.

Henry Ware Allen has compiled a conveniently collated questionnaire on the Single Tax. It is printed under the title, "What is the Single Tax?" This pamphlet, published by the Fairhope Single Tax Corporation, consists of thirty typical questions and answers concerning the philosophy of Henry George.

CORRESPONDENCE

A WORD FROM BRAZIL

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

It is for me a pleasure and an honor to be designated Brazilian correspondent of LAND AND FREEDOM. I love liberty as a supreme good of human dignity; and the Georgeist doctrine draws my greatest sympathies. But I ought to confess to you: economics is not my "line"; I am only a historian of literature.

My sojourn in Brazil will be short. I shall return to Portugal, where I should be glad to continue at your disposition. Prof. Mathieu Alonso visited me once at Lisbon and gave me some very interesting literature on the Georgeist movement. But since the Spanish civil war I heard no word from him. At Buenos Aires, Villalobos Dominguez visited me in 1936. I have been reading his articles in the journal *Nosotros*. I would like very much to establish contact with the Argentine Georgeists. It seems to me that conditions there are very favorable to the Georgeist movement, on account of the tradition of Rivadavia.

I have written a new book, "Dernieres Aventures," in which I make some reference to Henry George. I am also associate editor of two American periodicals—*Books Abroad*, and *Hispanic-American Historical Review*.

Please be assured of my best sentiments, and my Georgeist solidarity.

Sao Paulo, Brazil

PROF. FIDELINO DE FIGUEIREDO

MR. BENJAMIN ANSWERS MR. WILLCOX

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. W. R. B. Willcox's article, "A Challenge to Pessimism," I gather, was partially intended as a refutation of my article, "The Price of Freedom." It is not. It is but an example of the confused thinking one falls into when a distinction between "landowners" on the one hand and the "power to collect economic rent" on the other hand is attempted. Actually, the two terms are identical, because whoever collects the economic rent is the landowner, whether it be the community or an individual. Thus Georgeists are a body of land reformers, are a minority fighting landlordism.

The gist of Mr. Willcox's argument, however, is to be found in the following statements, after each of which I append my answer.

1—"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?" If Mr. Willcox means by "fighting" the landlords, the teaching of the philosophy of Henry George, then the answer is self-evident. If he means physical force, my answer is this: I have no objection to that course—provided the people want to take it because the landlords block peaceful reform. As to the landlords being indispensable to the collection of rent, as agents of the community, they certainly are not. True, George said they *might* be used in that function—but so might anybody else. As a matter of fact, landowners of huge estates employ agents to administer their investments. Thus, to argue, as Mr. Willcox does, that titles to land will pacify landowners, is to say the exiled aristocracy of past monarchies revel in their titles—when the truth of the matter is they are hopeful of regaining their confiscated lands, of which their titles are "legal" recognition.

2—"Georgeists should know that the . . . landowner's claim . . . 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." Mr. Willcox might be interested to know that the Constitution of the State of New York vests the land in the people's ownership, which is not a bad

start from a legal point of view. However, for a Georgeist to admit the legality of a perpetuated fraud—which is all the legal aspect of the situation is—is to acknowledge the right of private property in land, for how else is landlordism justified?

3—"If force is to be the arbiter in this case, Georgeists should know that the decision will go to the landowners, 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." Mr. Willcox, who claims to challenge the pessimists, should challenge himself at this point, because if his statement is true we might just as well tear up "Progress and Poverty" and deny that the people desire to better their existence. Many influential colonists held Mr. Willcox's view when debating the issue of independence or continued subservience to England. The Tories—who were the landowners—opposed independence, aided England in the struggle, and were deported to Canada for their truculence—their lands confiscated after the war. I do not wish to imply that civil war is the only way to attain the single tax society, but if that day should come—if it will prove to be the only efficacious manner of gaining our objective because the landlords will have contrived a way to block peaceful reform—it is logical to believe the people will fight. In a sense, Mr. Willcox answers the question himself when he says later on, "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." Exactly. And I might add that men will continue to fight until they realize that the single tax society is the only society in which they will not have to fight in order to gain access to the land.

4—"Is it possible that . . . 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 . . . propounding a doctrine no less evil, the inevitability of a class war between landlords and non-landlords. . . ?" Is it the *method of achievement* which interests Mr. Willcox, or the *validity* of the Georgeist philosophy? Lastly I must take issue with Mr. Willcox's implication that landlords are not at war with non-landlords. Of course they are! If this were not so, what other issues could be ascribed to the present war or any past war? (This is not to justify Hitler's attempt to displace England as No. 1 landowner; his idea is displacement, not common property.) Why are there depressions and poverty throughout the world if not for the wars the landlords are constantly waging against the rest of mankind? Certainly Georgeists are adhering "fanatically to still another 'ism'—*free-ism*."

New York, N. Y.

SANFORD J. BENJAMIN

A FREE TRADER SPEAKS

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I have plenty of friends to educate to the Georgeist doctrine, but the name of your valued journal is a little too strong for simple souls. Henry George once said that people will understand the land question when the free trade question is opened. Free trade is the pathfinder.

I therefore suggest that you change the name of your journal to FREE TRADE. You could perform your present function just the same, and even enlarge your field. You would attract the interest of a great many merchants.

There are innumerable examples, with a free trade moral, that could be used to direct attention to the economic problem. I mention a few of them: The City of Vatican is in Rome proper. In the Vatican City, a pound of sugar costs three cents. On the Italian

side, it costs twenty cents. In Gibraltar, a pound of coffee costs seven cents. On the Spanish side it costs three dollars. In the Dominican Republic, a pork costs two dollars. In New York, the same pork costs fifteen dollars. In Greece, a box of cigarettes costs two cents; in Spain, two dollars. In the United States a woman's dress can be bought for two dollars; a woman in Venezuela has to pay fifteen dollars. Etc., etc.

There is a great deal of information at this time about the restriction of commerce by the State. The merchants of the world are our allies, and it is time that we make use of this great force.

New York, N. Y.

ROGELIO CASAS CADILLA

AGAIN THE ISLAND

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. L. D. Beckwith, presumably by exercising a power of clairvoyance, says that because two men on an island live to themselves, there must be waste of products. Why? Is there any reason to suppose that Brown is not exploiting his holding to the full and consuming all his products, and that Jones is doing likewise? Here we see Mr. Beckwith again shifting his opponent's pieces in an endeavor to avoid checkmate. What he says about one being a better worker than the other is entirely irrelevant. Both may be equally skillful, equally industrious and equal in every other way and yet, because of better natural advantages resident in his land, Brown makes a living worth, say, £500 a year, while Jones ekes out a bare subsistence worth £50. Clearly the difference is rent; it cannot be wages, as equal work is posited. In both of Mr. Beckwith's replies he has endeavored to make out a case by assuming things which are not in my hypothesis, a clear indication that he is in difficulties. He asserts that when only two people are involved there cannot be rent. (When would rent start, with three, four, five?) George held that when two men want the same piece of land, rent exists. Poor Henry George! what did he know about rent! He, at any rate, has "not advanced since 1897!" I don't think your readers will have any difficulty in deciding who is right as regards this island illustration, and to elaborate the point further would be like whipping a dead horse, so, with your permission, I will now show that what applies to the island also holds in settled communities.

Mr. Beckwith props up his claim that "land can never have any value" by the theory that the higher the rent of a block the more that block will be found to use public (or other) utilities, let us say roads for short. Let us test this. Block A is fertile and needs no artificial manure. Its product is 10 X, cost of production 5 X, rent therefore 5 X. Block B is less fertile, but by using the roads and carting in fertilizer its production is brought up to 10 X. Both blocks will therefore (other things the same) use the roads equally so far as distribution of their products is concerned, but the poorer block—B—will, in addition, use the roads for bringing in fertilizer. The costs of production in this case are 5 X plus 1 X for fertilizer, rent therefore 4 X. Thus we see that the land with the higher rental makes less use of the roads. Q.E.D.

Now, another illustration. Suburban home sites with good soil will command a higher price (rental) than those with poor soil. This is because the home owner knows he can produce vegetables, etc., for his own use with less trouble and expense. He is not looking to market any of his crops and consequently does not use the roads for such purpose. On the poorer soil he would have to cart in manure, use more water, etc. Here again, higher rental value, less use of roads, etc. Again Q.E.D.

One more instance. Here in Auckland a quarter acre home site fetched £1500 while a similar site, abutting onto it at the back, was sold for £650. Why the difference in price? There are just two reasons and neither of them has anything to do with public (or other) services rendered at the site. Both blocks are identical in these things. The higher value (or rental) is due to the fact that the site faces the sun and affords an uninterrupted view of the Auckland harbour and the magnificent Hauraki gulf. The lower price site has its water view largely built out and faces away from the sun. I do not say that in this case the extra value is in the soil, but obviously it has nothing whatever to do with "services rendered at the location," which Mr. Beckwith asserts is the sole cause of the existence of rent. Still again Q.E.D.

Auckland, New Zealand

C. H. NIGHTINGALE

[The above letter closes the controversy between Messrs. C. H. Nightingale and L. D. Beckwith in the pages of LAND AND FREEDOM—Ed.]

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Have you ever considered the similarity of the teachings of Jesus with those of Henry George? Jesus said: "I have come that they may have life and have it more abundantly." "Pray ye thus: Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." "It is easier that a camel pass through the eye of a needle than that a rich man enter the kingdom of heaven."

Jesus gave us a law by which we must live in order to avoid the hell of poverty and war. Henry George gave us a system which would be Jesus' law applied—a system which would give us the Kingdom of God on earth. Under his plan—to remove the taxation of labor products and place it on land values—poverty would be abolished, peace and harmony assured, and human beings would tend to "love one another," as Jesus urged.

St. Louis, Mo.

A. L. PICKHARDT

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I think that LAND AND FREEDOM is not only the best organ of the Single Tax movement, but really it is the only one of any intrinsic value. Frankly, it is the only one I ever read.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

JOHN C. ROSE

(Continued from page 31)

be unnecessary with a just distribution of wealth—rent to governments to pay for public works and services, wages to labor, and interest for the use of certain wealth which we call capital.

Experience, however, does not favor the idea of what is really economic interest disappearing. For, as George has so clearly shown, wages and interest rise and fall together. In new communities where land is cheap and easily accessible, they are high. When land is dear, because privately monopolized, they are low. Interest, however, would not trouble labor or be a burden to labor where rent was used for its proper purpose. Under such conditions labor would get its full earnings as natural resources would be open to men.

I submit that arguing about interest, wasting time over money and currency are lamentable deductions from the efforts necessary to remove the basic injustice—the monopoly of natural resources. While this idle disputation goes on, the great masses of mankind have to pay to live and work on the earth, fight for it when occasion arises, and eke out a very bare existence in old age.

The Philosophy of Freedom

A Special Review of a Remarkable Book

"The Philosophy of Freedom," by Gaston Haxo. Land and Freedom, 1941. 210 pages. \$1.00.

A PRACTICAL observer for many years of the old propaganda methods, Mr. Haxo has had a splendid opportunity to develop his ideas of teaching. He has taught many "Progress and Poverty" classes in the Henry George School of Social Science, having been since 1937 the head of the correspondence course division of the School. It was his experience in this field that enabled him to discover the "weak spots" in the average student's understanding. Extending the observation, he has discerned a similar inability of other readers of "Progress and Poverty" to grasp the technical aspects of the subject. Thus did he come to realize that the full implications of the philosophy have been missed by many of our "Georgeists."

Concentrating upon the difficult parts of "Progress and Poverty," Mr. Haxo has recast and adapted them to the needs of those to whom the classic does not easily unfold. Even those for whom "Progress and Poverty" presents no seeming difficulty will derive an added enjoyment from that masterpiece upon reading "The Philosophy of Freedom." They will appreciate the many charts and diagrams which function as an integral part of the text, and constitute one of its most important features. Even "P & P" experts may well profit from a perusal of "The Philosophy of Freedom."

While the author deserves credit for the manner in which he handles the economics of "Progress and Poverty," this review would be incomplete without a recognition of his gift of philosophic expression. Mr. Haxo writes with inspiration, and his loftier passages entitle him to rank with the outstanding expounders of Henry George. Indeed, an appreciation of "The Philosophy of Freedom" can only lead to a deeper appreciation of "Progress and Poverty". This is the modest and ultimate purpose of the work.

Each of the ten books of "The Philosophy of Freedom" is headed by "Gems from Henry George," carefully selected for strengthening and embellishing the text. Mr. Haxo has employed the classroom approach throughout, and has modernized the exposition. Beginning with the definition of the terms, the author follows "Progress and Poverty" in regular sequence, diligently compiling and integrating the various chapters into his adaptation. His handling of "The Laws of Distribution" is particularly effective. It is replete with interesting charts and invaluable footnotes, elucidating the capitalization of rent, the margin of production, etc.

In his treatment of interest Mr. Haxo presents a thorough account of George's theory. He makes the point that divergent views on this subject can in no wise affect the fundamental features of land reform. Here again charts are employed to drive home the functions of labor and capital, wages and interest.

"Material Progress and Distribution" is presented with the assistance of twenty diagrams. The entire Story of the Savannah is depicted in two illustrations. Equally fascinating are the chapters on trade and exchange, with mathematical calculations of the advantages of a free economy. "The Remedy and the Justice of the Remedy" is eloquently portrayed. All of the other main headings of "Progress and Poverty" are likewise conscientiously interpreted. There is never a dull moment in "The Philosophy of Freedom", from the introductory biographical sketch of Henry George to the Ode to Liberty in Book X.

A useful appendix, "Land Value Taxation in Practice" and a serviceable index, conclude the work. The typography is of high quality and the format is of convenient size. Every Georgeist and every advocate of freedom should want to possess this remarkable contribution to economic literature.