

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

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

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

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

The Land Question In Roumania and Hungary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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