

to sell their flocks; the clothing manufacturers, who are worrying why their suits of clothing remain on their shelves, etc., etc.

No, it is not overproduction but underconsumption from which we are suffering.

In an hour's ride from the center of New York I will take Professor Brown to New Jersey, or out on Long Island or Staten Island, and show him tens of thousands of acres of land standing idle, badly in need of human hands to work them. What is true of New York is true of Chicago, Philadelphia and every other large city, not only in the United States but all over the world.

Not even China is overpopulated. The fear of overpopulation is therefore academic, like the college student's fear of what would happen when the coal supply of our planet would be exhausted.

Professor Brown writes (page 371):

"Nothing is so important as to establish the principle that those who bring children into the world must provide these children with a childhood not wholly devoid of opportunity and of happiness, and therefore, by implication, that they must not have more children than can be so provided."

This statement is hardly in keeping with the sound thinking of the rest of the book. In the first place, in our present economic disorder, no parent knows, when he brings even one child into the world, whether or not he will be able to provide for him. Given the responsibility to support a new life, every normal man and woman gladly assumes the burden. All a normal father asks is *opportunity to work*, to support his child, and with the arrival of each additional child every normal father is stimulated to greater and greater activity. Our present lack of system denies him this opportunity.

Professor Brown believes that the reason why large classes of population cannot enjoy life is because their wages are low and because their families are large (page 372). Wages are low for reasons which the Professor clearly shows only five pages further on, where he speaks of the system—

"under which the majority must pay tribute to a minority for the privilege of living and working on those parts of the surface of the earth where labor is especially productive."

Professor Brown, throughout his work, clearly shows the fallacies of the socialists' arguments. The arguments in chapter six against the tariff are simply devastating.

"The tariff is a general grab, in which, so to speak, each citizen attempts to pick the pocket of others and has his own picked at the same time."

In a bitter passage, pages 50-51, Professor Brown shows the difficulties the trained student of economics encounters when he seeks to overcome the fallacies of the politician. Every word he writes is true, but it seems to me this discussion is hardly in place in a book on economics.

In calling attention to these few points in respect to which I differ with Professor Brown it is not my desire to give the impression that I do not endorse his book.

On the contrary, I consider it a most excellent piece of work, of which the professor may well be proud.

I recommend it highly to all who sincerely desire to learn what ails us, economically speaking. But I warn them that they must possess a mind capable of clear thinking and a determination to follow the truth wherever it leads, else they will get little or nothing from Professor Brown's work.

B. W. BURGER.

CORRESPONDENCE

APPROVES RALSTON'S PLAN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of LAND AND FREEDOM. I have been looking over again the last number, and feel how much we need just such a publication, more particularly

for the purpose of keeping us together, as well as for passing the magazine along to those not informed.

Mr. Jackson H. Ralston's plan to have carefully prepared constitutional amendments in states where such an idea seems feasible especially in Massachusetts, which will be submitted to the vote of the people for the purpose of bringing about tax reform, seems to me most practical. In connection with our publishing lecture and radio activity, this should impress people with the fact that we are determined to do something, and help to crystalize public opinion generally.

I particularly hope we can have a real get-together this fall, and put over some constructive plans.

Cambridge, Mass.

LOUIS F. WESTON.

FROM THE AUTHOR OF "WHAT'S WRONG WITH TAXATION"
EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I want to thank you for the very excellent review in the last number of LAND AND FREEDOM. Making all due and proper allowances for differences of opinion on matters collateral to the main argument, I feel more than pleased with the endorsement of What's Wrong with Taxation?

In the writing of this book I am trying to reach a public which so far has been cold to our presentations. We have so often become so impassioned as to be fairly inarticulate, and this has detracted from the efficacy of our work, at least in my opinion. If we would make progress it will prove necessary to revise our own usual attitude.

I shall watch with a certain confidence the reaction to the article urging Massachusetts to come forward. There are men and women enough in the state to start a valuable movement.

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

CAUSE AND CONSEQUENCE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Enclosed please find my check for \$2.00 in payment of bill dated the 15th inst. just received for my subscription ending July—August 1931.

Will you please discontinue my subscription. I have given up hope and don't care a damn whether the world is reformed or not.

P. S.: I voted for Hoover.

Kansas City, Mo.

SAM L. CASEY.

A CORRECTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Progress is unjustly pilloried in the *Commonweal*, March 21, p. (94) "The Truth About Java." It states

"In the January-February issue of LAND AND FREEDOM a paragraph appears about the island of Java. This same paragraph previously appeared in the *Fairhope Courier*, another American publication, which in turn, attributes its formation to *Progress*, an Australian journal. It runs as follows:—

"Java, a little island about as large as England, supports a population of 37,400,000, and has no unemployment menace. How do they do it? High tariff? Prohibition? Gold standard? Private operation of public utilities? Not a bit of it. Land speculation is forbidden. Land is treated as Government property, and is let on hereditary lease, or communal holdings."

"It is true (adds the 'C') that Java is almost exactly the same size as England, and that it has numerically an almost identical population. It is true also that there is very little unemployment in Java, *except amongst Europeans*. It is not, however, correct to say that the communal right to the land is established in Java, or that its economic rent is collected and used for communal purposes in place of taxation."

It then recounts quite a number of taxes.

From the foregoing your readers would conclude that *Progress* claimed the C. L. P. principles were operating in Java. No such misleading statement was made or implied by the writer. He was quite aware that Java had tariffs and other taxes.

The *Progress* article (Nov 1, 1930), in its reference to Java contained these words only:

"No room!" Those who say that shamefully disparage Australia. Why, our tiny neighbor—Java—about the size of England, but of