

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.