

such a programme because his business of selling lots would be very largely abolished. The business of selling lots at the present time is to paint a picture to the purchaser of the large amount of unearned increment which he can secure sometime in the future by buying the particular lot which the salesman has to sell. Our programme would improve every kind of business except the business of speculating in land and would be the death blow to land speculation.

We have to meet the objections which will be aroused by our complete programme sometime, and it seems to me that we would be further along if we used a nomenclature which would make it somewhat easier for the general public to understand just what we propose to do.

What we want to accomplish is to reduce the selling price of all lands to practically zero, thereby making land common property, by taking the ground rent. But, it will be quite clear to anyone that when the community takes the ground rent that the private, continuous, and exclusive possession of land will not be interfered with.

I remember once when talking to a church group on this subject that a fine old gentleman who had been induced to read "Progress and Poverty" by Tom L. Johnson, raised the point that Henry George proposed to make land common property. That is as far as he got in the book. I presume he assumed Henry George proposed to divide up the land each year, each five years, or each ten years among everybody, and he knew a scheme of this sort would be impossible; therefore he turned down the whole philosophy of Henry George, because he did not appreciate that the taking of the ground rent by the community would make land common property without interfering with the continuous, exclusive, and private possession of land by the individual.

It is because I believe that the presentation of our philosophy from the standpoint of allowing the community to collect ground rent and abolishing all taxation will appeal to the ordinary person more powerfully than a proposition to increase taxes on land and decrease taxes on other things that I am urging this method of presentation.

I think that we ought to ask for all that we expect to get eventually, which is the whole ground rent, rather than ask for part of what we expect to get eventually by talking of the taxation of land values. It is not difficult to get the idea across to most people that the presence and activity of the community creates land values which are simply actual or anticipated ground rents capitalized.

It follows then that in taking ground rents for public purposes that the public is simply collecting what it produces by its presence and activity.

It will take time and repeated presentation to get the public to realize that the collection of ground rent by the public will cause the selling price of land to sink to zero, thereby making land common property, but it will be much easier to get this idea across by talking of collect-

ing ground rent than by talking of making land common property by taxation of land values, especially as our programme calls for the taxation of land values to increase until there is no value left.

Our programme is one of fundamental reform, and one that will meet the hearty opposition of most of those that profit by the private appropriation of ground rent and by all that are closely associated with them. On the other hand, all that we have to do to make converts for our cause is to have it comprehended.

We all believe that the rent of the land belongs to the people and that the first duty of the government is to collect it and abolish all taxation—and if we believe it, why not advertise it?

I therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that the Henry George Foundation Congress here assembled adopt this statement as our slogan and stand on the proposition that "the rent of the land belongs to the people and that it is the first duty of the government to collect it and abolish all taxation."

Address of Prof. F. W. Roman

HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, SEPT. 10

PROF. ROMAN said in part: The social philosophy of Henry George has come into a new and rich inheritance. Modern progressive education has within recent years discovered that it would not make effective progress unless the factors of environment were reorganized and made creative of thought. Rousseau in his *Emile*, 1762, had already announced to the world that education proceeds through man, nature and things. Ever since that period, educational thought has been laying increasing stress on the facts of environment.

The great educational revolutions of Pestalozzi and Froebel were built on this motive. Pestalozzi believed that he could reform man through environment. His earliest schools were composed of children taken from the unfortunate outcast ranks of life. He placed them on farms, assigned them to delightful tasks, and the world took cognizance that this educator had made a new discovery. Kings, princes and the influential from all the world went to Yverdon to see the work of twenty-five years of this new experiment. John Dewey, the world's greatest living scholar, is the last product of this new role of teaching. He has given it the most profound philosophic setting we have had up to this time, and it is significant for the Henry George movement that Dewey should have discovered that, to attain the conditions necessary for the best possible education, he would find himself under the necessity of cooperating with the motives and ideals of the philosophy of Henry George.

When it was announced within the last year, to many of the land taxers, that John Dewey had given his approval to the social and economic philosophy of Henry George,

it was heralded as an outstanding event for the cause which Henry George had announced to the world. It is safe to say that most people have, even at that, failed to get a greater part of the significance of this new recruit. Most people would consider that it was the addition of a very important man, and that that would have the effect of winning other friends who, more or less, take their cue and guidance on the basis of authoritative opinion. Whereas we in no wise wish to underestimate the personal influence that John Dewey would have in any cause or activity in which he might enlist his sympathies, it seems to be more important to point out that what is really taking place is that a whole school of educational philosophy has suddenly found itself in the camp of the philosophers who are sympathetic to the social philosophy of which Henry George was the great exponent.

What has really happened is far more profound than the casual observer may know. It is not some new recruits that have been enlisted, but it is the confluence of a stream of educational thought that has been evolving for 150 years, and now finally it has joined forces with the economic evolution that had its start with the French physiocrats, was further developed by Rousseau, given additional clarity by Adam Smith, and finally given a perfect statement from its economic side by Patrick Dove. Then again, this same principle seems to have been discovered and announced independently by Henry George. It is a truth that is finding its way. We could already show that it has been thought out in various parts of the world without necessary help from other sources. It is an interesting case of thought parallelism.

Now, the same forces that seem to have been provoking economic readjustment for the last two centuries have also been reacting in a way to bring about educational readjustment, and the important idea that we wish to present tonight is the fact that these two streams of evolution have, in the last two years, found themselves in a confluence, and from this date both the economic idea and the educational idea will go forward with increasing momentum and accelerated pace because of the mutual support which the one gives the other. It also gives an additional assurance of the correctness of both the economic philosophy and the educational philosophy, in view of the fact that the trend of the thinking seems to carry both streams of thought in its current. One current of thought might be temporary, an abnormality, but two currents that can show continuous growth and development for nearly two centuries gain an additional prestige thereby. There is something compelling about this new union of the doctrines of progressive education and the economic philosophy that finds it necessary to stress economic justice.

Dewey and his followers have learned that education of the child goes forward best in a school environment that has fair play, that gives the child all the rewards which his labor gains for him. Dewey has found out that school

work is most successful when carried on as a conjoint co-operative activity; that the reward comes out of the activity itself; that the child is happy when he makes discoveries that secure mental and emotional release, and this is freedom.

It is not at all strange that very soon he should come to understand the idea that, if he is going to succeed in the school and the community, the child will have to come from a home in which there is the atmosphere of justice and economic freedom. Fathers and mothers who are exploited economically are not able to give their children their just rewards. Dewey and his school seized upon the idea that, not only the school environment must be ideal, but the community in which the child lives must also have economic justice and political equality, and at that moment some one pointed out that there had already been a long evolution of a new economic philosophy that was striving to attain just these things, and this philosophy was the doctrine of Henry George.

Hence Dewey and his followers found that there was nothing else for them to do except to join in a cooperative way with the school of economic reforms that had already been pointing out the way, lo, these many decades.

The Land Question in British Politics

MATTHEW WARRINER AT HENRY GEORGE
CONGRESS SEPT. 12

WHILE I am not a Single Taxer, I do believe that Henry George was the greatest moral and economic teacher in the history of the world. He set forth very clearly in the *Law of Human Progress* that mankind could achieve peace and satisfaction only by associating with one another on equal terms.

The economic condition in Great Britain is described as distressing, as appalling and intolerable. However, I contend that when a situation really becomes intolerable something is done about it, and those who are preventing the situation from improving will have cause to fear.

England has lost her supremacy in the markets of the world. In the coal industry, which was a great economic resource of England, today there are 250,000 surplus men. If I lived in South Wales, I would be a surplus man. I have heard that there are 500,000 children in South Wales who are actually on the point of starvation.

As to the textile trade, all the countries of Europe are learning to manufacture their own cotton and wool materials.

In the majority of trades the ranks of the unemployed are increasing, and are now officially stated to be 1,500,000. This figure includes only those on the registered exchanges. It does not include a lot of men who are too proud to beg because there is some pride in the men of England yet. Visualize two or three million people out