

Arizona Star—the best paper Mr. Canning found on his southwestern travels. Mr. Mathews wrote Mr. Canning, "I have purchased a copy of Henry George's book 'Progress and Poverty', and am now in the midst of reading it. I have rarely read any book which has such a clear, forceful style."

Hon. Jackson H. Ralston writes to the Lecture Association: "As you are doubtless aware we are engaged in a most important campaign in California for the adoption of the enclosed (land value taxation) constitutional amendment through the initiative. The Single Taxers are practically without exception united behind it and the State Federation of Labor is with it. We can put it over, in my opinion, but it will call for every ounce of strength we can bring to bear or can our friends throughout the United States. At the present stage of the fight—one of organization—you can contribute to our success through making us better known to each other. You must have very considerable lists of people friendly to us in every part of the State, and such a list will be of real value to us. If you will kindly send it to me I will see that it reaches its useful destinations." The lists are on the way!

Mr. Edwin L. Upp of McKeesport, Pa., writes: "Mr. McNair's victory in Pittsburgh yesterday was indeed pleasing, especially so because of his clear enunciation of the principles for which he stands, during his campaign. I am hopeful that the subject of taxation will be kept in the forefront as much as possible during the term of his administration. Here at McKeesport I consider that day lost when I have not called our philosophy to the attention of some one or more of my friends and am pleased to say that more and more people are getting interested. I hope that some day in the not far distant future it will be possible to form an active organization locally."

And our friend, Dr. E. G. Freyer, secretary of the Henry George Club of South Bend, Ind., writes: "I talk Single Tax every day, often twice and oftener; I think I am making some impression because I have people stop me to ask me about it. I am planning some active work done in the way of organization. Rabbi William Stern, a prominent Jewish leader in the city, is preparing a sermon on our favorite subject."

I have provided him with an abundance of literature. . . ."

The great work goes on!

Messages to Henry George Congress

Very sorry cannot be with you. Best wishes for success of your most important undertaking.—JOHN S. CODMAN, Boston, Mass.

I appreciate very much your kind sentiments and the way in which you express them that I might be present at the Annual Henry George Congress in Chicago. I am very sorry indeed to say that it will be quite impossible for me to get away to attend. The work here is all-embracing and holds me to it.

I ask you kindly to accept the good wishes of the British Henry George movement for the success of your Congress, and we will look forward eagerly to the report that success has been achieved.

A. W. MADSEN, London, Eng.

I am much complimented by your invitation and if my engagements permitted me to make a trip to Chicago I should be happy to accept your invitation, but it is quite impossible for me to make the trip at this time.

It may interest you to know that I had the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with Mr. Henry George. Many years ago—in the nineties—when I was a young lawyer, I was the assignee for the creditors of Charles L. Webster & Company, the firm which published Mr. George's books.

I do not recall just what the occasion was which took me to his house on East 18th or 19th Street in this city, as I remember it, but

I vividly remember the time I spent in his company, sitting with him beside a little coal grate and talking our business over.

He was a man of gentle manners and quiet speech. He took a large and patient view of his business relations with the firm. The latter's failure was a source of embarrassment to him, and perhaps of annoyance. But he did not show it. As I left him I was quite aware that I had been in the presence of a very great man. And that feeling grew as I had occasion to meet him subsequently.

Thank you again for your pleasant invitation and let me again express my regret in being unable to accept it.

BAINBRIDGE COLBY, N. Y. City.

I am in receipt of your letter of the 3rd inst. in which you extend an invitation to me to address the Eighth Annual Henry George Congress to be held in Chicago, September 18th to 20th. While I am deeply appreciative of the honor and privilege thus extended to me I find that it will be simply impossible for me to be in Chicago at the time mentioned, because of pressing matters which will make my presence in New York imperative.

I have made note of your comments relating to that phase of the National Recovery Act pertaining to financing a Back to the Land Movement. The machinery of this act is now being set up in Washington and in due course all of us, no doubt, will have more concrete information relative to the programme that will be followed by the administration in carrying out the provisions of this act.

Please convey my sincere appreciation to your organization for the invitation so kindly extended to me but which, unfortunately, as above indicated, I cannot accept.

BERNARR MACFADDEN, N. Y. City.

It is in possible for me to anticipate my duties as far in advance as that, or to make any even tentative engagements. The most I can say, is that I would like very much to be with you if it is possible.

FREDERIC C. HOWE, Washington, D. C.

I have just received the prospectus for the Single Tax convention in Chicago and it creates in me a wish to be a part of it, but I fear it will not be possible. My home is now in California and the journey seems too long and too expensive for a man of my years and lack of resources. My very best wishes go with its deliberations however, and I am sending a small check in accordance with your letter to help pay for the expenses of the preliminary work.

I see on the list of speakers many of the men and women who were active when I was active. I must infer that they are all younger than I or more enduring, for I shrink from public duties at seventy-three. I am content to let Darrow and White and Bigelow represent the movement as they did when I was young—or at least younger than I am now. Please remember me to Dana Miller, Bolton Hall, Frank Stephens and all the other "old timers" whom you chance to meet. In these rash and experimental times our theories should have a counterbalancing effect. Most of us, I think, are in all essentials individualistic now as we were then.

HAMLIN GARLAND, Hollywood, Calif.

Having just returned from a nearly five months' absence, I find on my desk yours of August 17. I regret that it will be impossible for me to attend the gathering in Chicago and take part in it. Just now I am thoroughly tired of all travel after 14,000 miles of it. I wish all possible success to the convention, and desire to express the hope that its members will devote themselves to the consideration of practical measures for the advancement of our cause, laying aside all purely academic discussions. These may have their use, but to me seem to lead to the development of differences rather than to progress.

JACKSON H. RALSTON, Palo Alto, Calif.

Since your special invitation to the Henry George Congress to be held in Chicago September 25 arrived, I have been hoping that I might be there with you but have now concluded that it will not be feasible. I want to thank you for your kind attention and to extend my greet-

ings to those with whom I have so much in common and to express the hope that the congress will be a great success.

At this time we have the extraordinary spectacle of a great government which is responsible for a most iniquitous system of taxation and which has ventured to extend its functions beyond the limits of democracy into the realm of state socialism, assuming to possess greater wisdom than the business men of the country and which, therefore, has dictated to these men what to do with regard to the wages, hours of labor and prices. This brings to mind the brilliant characterization by Henry George of the fatal weakness of state socialism which consists in assuming to "rule the wonderful complex and delicate relations of their frames by conscious will." The time has indeed arrived for urging with renewed vigor the philosophy of Henry George.

HENRY WARE ALLEN, Wichita, Kas.

I am greatly disappointed that I will miss seeing so many of the leading Single Taxers at this Congress and of hearing the only gospel of salvation that can save the world from even greater chaos and poverty than we have yet seen. What an opportunity the Washington administration is missing! Its NRA Will'o' the Wisp, with its upside-down economics, will be, in future histories, classed as the most gigantic delusion of a century.

Of course this foolish experiment will soon collapse. Will it be followed by another piece of tom-foolery or by something half rational? It is too much to hope that Washington will discover, in the taxation of land values, the plain, simple and easy road to national recovery and to fuller and more permanent prosperity than we have had in fifty years—technocracy to the contrary, notwithstanding.

BYRON W. HOLT, N. Y. City.

Having just returned from Mexico, I find my first opportunity to reply to your letter of August 26, and to assure you it was with the sincerest regret that I gave up the hope of attending the Conference of Georgists at Chicago this month. But it has my most earnest convictions and if the prayers of this unrighteous one are of avail it must be fruitful of good things.

May I tell of a happy experience recently in the city of Mexico, while studying the murals of Rivera in the three-storied courtyard of the fine building of the Federal Ministry of Education? These give a colorful and vivid presentment of Mexican history, depicting realistically the sufferings of the natives: first, under the exploitation of the Conquistadores, and second, under that of their modern equivalents, the international concessionaires—coupled with the exactions of the Church throughout both tragic periods. Between them these three forces have mulcted the people of their rights in their own land. Imagine, then the delight of a Georgist to find, at the end of the court, the whole series summed up, as it were, in a legend which is roughly translated as follows:

The land is for all, like the air, the water and the light and heat of the sun.

The true civilization will be the harmony of men with the earth and of men among themselves.

To find such a challenge, "plain for all men to see," in a government building of one of the so-called somewhat backward nations, just emerging from over twenty years odd of revolution, may well hearten all land emancipators. Can anything more inspiring be invoked for the Conference?

EMILY E. F. SKEEL, Pasadena, Calif.

Letters of regret were also received from Grace Isabel Colbron, S. A. Stockwell, Lewis Jerome Johnson, Francis Neilson, A. C. Campbell, and others.

"DON'T scab" says the labor leader as he gives his support to economic measures which create unemployment and leave scabbing as the only opportunity open to millions.

Reply to Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown's Paper Read at the Henry George Congress

ARE Single Taxers Fundamentalists? Do they regard "Progress and Poverty" as an economical bible? Are they a "bunch of nuts, wholly impervious to the dictates of common sense?" Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown of Missouri State University thinks so, at least in regard to a large body of Single Taxers, if not all. I have quoted expressions from a paper by the professor read at the Henry George Congress at Chicago. The professor says that our economic reading is limited, confined almost entirely to the writings of one man, and that we consider it rank heresy to suggest any other tax than a tax on land values. He says we believe any other tax is "essentially wicked," and that, "if a millionaire dies with no near kin and intestate, we would prefer that his entire fortune should go to some worthless seventh cousin," for if the state should take any of the fortune, taxation has not been confined to its only just and natural source, the economic rent of land.

DON'T ALL THINK ALIKE

In several years of rather intimate association with Single Taxers both here and in Europe, I have failed to notice any such criticisms of them as Prof. Brown mentions nor any such unanimity of views among them as he implies. Besides at the Copenhagen International Conference, at the Edinburgh International Conference, and at minor gatherings in London I have heard spirited debates regarding many economic problems treated by Henry George, but not considered by Single Taxers as forever settled by him.

As to our considering any other tax, save one on land values as "essentially wicked," I know of many Single Taxers who in spite of the apparent contradiction in terms have been earnest advocates of income taxes, particularly on the big incomes, or higher brackets. Such income taxes are held to be justifiable because by such taxation we are taking a portion of economic rent, as many large fortunes are due to land monopoly.

OBJECTS TO SINGLE TAX

Prof. Brown objects to the term Single Tax, and my observation is that a large majority of Single Taxers also object to it. Mr. Miller's journal formerly known as the *Single Tax Review* is now known as LAND AND FREEDOM. In California the words Single Tax are seldom heard in connection with the advocacy of land value taxation. In the Ingram Institute the words were particularly taboo by Mr. Ingram. Stoughton Cooley never uses them in his paper called *Tax Facts*. L. D. Beckwith of Stockton, Calif., calls his journal *No Taxes*, but he swears by Henry George economics. J. W. Graham Peace, an enthusiastic

disciple of George, in London, never advocates a Single Tax on land values but always the taking of ground rent for public purposes. His journal is called *The Commonwealth*.

Prof. Brown accuses us of being inconsistent, sometimes holding that a tax on land values would provide for all expenses of government as now conducted and leave a big surplus, so that riding on the cars would be as free as riding in the elevator of big buildings; and yet at other times he says that we hold that farm lands apart from improvements have little value. Well, this shows that Prof. Brown has noticed that sometimes we do *not* always agree, although we may be, what he says some folks call us, "a fanatical religious cult with fixed dogmas to which we adhere regardless of logical cost, and with whom it is useless to reason."

WRONG THEORY OF INTEREST

Prof. Brown says that Henry George's theory of interest is wrong, so also says Joseph Dana Miller, certainly one of our leading Single Taxers and the publisher of our leading journal. This question of interest I have heard debated in a spirited manner at a number of Single Tax conventions.

Then Prof. Brown says we consider it heresy to suggest that business depression can be due in any significant degree to the mismanagement of our money and credit system, or that a fluctuating price level, (for example, the rapidly falling prices of 1930-33) is of itself a serious evil independently of land speculation.

Had Prof. Brown been present at the Chicago convention, he would have learned from the address of Western Starr that the evil of an unstable monetary unit, and of the monopolization of credit, is keenly appreciated by some of us, if not by all of us. So I think Prof. Brown utterly mistaken when he says that we insist that fluctuations in the measure of value are of *no importance*, or have no relation to the evils from which we have recently suffered. I have never known a Single Taxer who contended that if we had the Single Tax fluctuations of money value could not occur.

Prof. Brown believes that we make rather too much of our free trade doctrine. He says "in my opinion, a land tax advocate may properly support both free trade, *and* a stable dollar as reforms of importance."

EXPURGATE "PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

Prof. Brown would like to see an edition of "Progress and Poverty" with all the discussion as to the definition of terms relegated to an "appendix" at the end of the volume.

In spite of all these mistakes, (and others) to which Prof. Brown alludes, I believe some of his criticisms may prove most wholesome. He reveals that he thinks we make too much of the theory that there are certain natural laws, sacred because really of divine origin. Consequently it is said we are always seeking natural laws

of economics, and then trying to conform to them. I know that a large school of Single Taxers hold this view. Mr. Beckwith of *No Taxes* says in a recent article: "When Edison invented the electric lamp he had only to adapt his work to natural laws, already planned and in operation, and ready to serve him, and he asks, Do you believe there are natural laws of economics already planned and in operation and ready to serve us? If so, our *first* task should be to discover and to understand those laws rather than to plan our machinery."

TWO SCHOOLS OF SINGLE TAXERS

There is another large school of Single Taxers who while acknowledging that Mr. Beckwith's views are entirely in harmony with Henry George economics, yet hold that they are out of harmony with economics as taught in some of our leading schools and universities, and are in fact entirely inconsistent with modern evolutionary philosophy.

They argue that there is *nothing sacred* about natural laws. That in the course of natural law men are subject to attack from all kinds of diseases, that in earlier stages of their life history they were continually subject to attack from hostile animals as they now are from hostile bacteria. They argue that hurricanes and earthquakes come in conformity to natural law, and in short that natural laws work malevolently as often as they work benevolently. Consequently we *can learn nothing* from them as to what men should do.

So this school does not at all regard with repugnance "*managed economics*." It believes that managed economics are better than unmanaged ones, as natural law by no means always works for the advantage and blessing of mankind. I am not saying to which of these schools of economics Prof. Brown belongs, but I *surmise* that he may be most properly classified with the believers in managed economics.

STRATEGY

Prof. Brown in his paper read at the Congress gives some good ideas as to strategy of Single Tax advocates. He warns us against our becoming too "respectable," or too ready to preen ourselves on the midly favorable comments which our respectables sometimes vouchsafe to us.

"For example" he says, "some of our numbers have seemed to be unduly elated because Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler in a recent address referred with apparent respect to Henry George and to Henry George's great book."

As Dr. Butler carefully refrains from saying that he thought Henry George's proposal for the remedy of poverty was a right proposal he can not see that Single Taxers gain much if any thing from quoting him.

Prof. Brown calls our attention to the more or less successful campaigns in recent years to take *off* of land rather than to put more taxes on land values. He points out that:

"Private property in land is familiar to the ordinary