

Death of Viscount Snowden

WORD received yesterday of the death of Philip Snowden must have been a shock to countless thousands who had been his admirers and supporters during his long, dauntless fight—although his years of invalidism should have been preparation for the suddenness of his passing.

Sad that it took place before he reinstated himself in the faith of those who felt he had failed in the taxation of land values and the free trade fights, when his courage and tenacity were most needed. Sad that his devoted companion and champion, his wife, was not with him at the end.

It is deeply to be regretted that the articles telling of his death and giving a thumbnail sketch of his life—those articles at least printed here in New York—stress his adherence to the Socialists and completely ignore his unswerving support of the taxation of land values. It is part, no doubt, of the injustice we Georgeists have to bear in being considered “outmoded,” and “out of date” and “unimportant.” But Philip Snowden, I believe, did not fail to show his belief in the truth, as enunciated by Henry George, in *real* free trade—the freedom of trade in production as well as in exchange—and he knew that the taxation of land values, or Single Tax as we call it here, was the only way to bring it about.

I had the pleasure of meeting him three times. While he was Chancellor of the Exchequer I visited him in Downing Street. I was not prepared to find him the fragile, ill-looking man who greeted me standing, supporting himself against his desk, holding his other hand out to me as I crossed the wide room to him. I was not prepared for the pain in his white face; pain deeper than physical pain—that I at the time designated to myself as “*weltschmerz*.”

The second time I met him was at a big public luncheon given, if I remember correctly, by a group of free traders. Just as previously he had told me of his belief in the need for taxing land values, so at this free trade gathering Philip Snowden openly espoused our cause and shortly thereafter brought it to the forefront of political discussion when he fathered the fight to reappraise the land of Great Britain and to raise the tax on its value. That he was beaten in this fight added to the world's tragedy. Later came the protection or free trade fight, in which he compromised unfortunately, and thereby lost many who had been his staunch friends.

He retired from political life and moved through a simple but capacious house set on an English lawn and shadowed by fine trees, in the country near Aldershot, and there, on September 10 of last year I was taken to call on him by that faithful Georgean—Andrew MacLaren, M. P. Our visit was very brief as we had to make a train back to London, and the chief impression I carried

away of Viscount Snowden, was of his gratitude that a fellow Member of Parliament should have taken the trouble to go so far to see him.

For my own part I shall always find it difficult to believe that the courteous gentleman I found him to be, was reputed, on occasion, to have shown such bitterness toward his political opponents. I shall always feel gratitude for his strength and courage and dedication to the Truth.—ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE.

Activities of the Manhattan Single Tax Club

PRESIDENT Charles H. Ingersoll addressed a meeting at the Y. M. C. A., Waterbury, Conn., on Sunday, April 25, at 3:00 P. M.

Mr. Ingersoll, having originated the watch which not only made the dollar famous, but which has had a sale of some three hundred millions, largely produced in this Connecticut town, was inspired to a very interesting and somewhat reminiscent talk.

Dr. Royal E. S. Hayes was present with several friends who assisted in making the quiz following Mr. Ingersoll's talk exceptionally interesting. Especially was the point of economic rent discussed in all of its phases.

Dr. Hayes asked whether monopoly rent and speculative rent should not have separate consideration. To this the speaker confessed lack of enlightenment; and it is here mentioned for possible discussion among your readers. It is referred to in detail in a tract published by the H. G. Tract Society of Endwell, N. Y.

THE WOV PUBLIC SERVICE FORUM

The 1937 broadcasting series of the WOV Public Service Forum has been announced with Mr. Ingersoll as its chairman. Last season this forum comprised twenty-five forum hours including as guest speakers, Whidden Graham, Benj. W. Burger, Marietta Johnson, and many others on economic subjects, selected and developed by the chairman.

This year, the first two forums are 100 per cent Single Tax. The first had as its guest speaker, Anna George de Mille, her subject being “Henry George and the Problem of Poverty.” Her talk occupied about half the time, and the balance comprising prepared questions by the chairman, and the answers by the guest speaker. This broadcast was pronounced one of the most successful ever put on the air, by friends of the movement, and broadcasting professionals.

The Forum of May 16 will have Benjamin C. Marsh, Secretary of the Peoples Lobby, as the speaker on the subject of “Natural Resources in their relation to Peace.” Mr. Marsh will present a 100 per cent Georgeist statement which with Mr. Ingersoll's help will make this a

powerful contribution to the cause of peace and economic freedom.

LAND AND FREEDOM readers are urged to tune in to this series on WOV station; 1130 kilocycles, 6:30 to 7:00 P. M. every Sunday.

Mr. Ingersoll's current events broadcasts are proceeding as usual on Long Island, Manhattan, and in Philadelphia and Wilmington.

Following are some of his most recent talks:

DORIS ANGEL, Office Secretary.

* * *

The iteration and reiteration of one powerful economic truth is not all there is to "teaching economics;" nor is the teaching of a complete economic philosophy necessarily the most profitable form of teaching economics; nor should either of these methods be depreciated, by the development of other good methods of teaching economics.

If it were possible to assemble a hundred million youths and grown ups of this country in "a class" and give to them an average does of 1/100 of a complete knowledge of economics, who can say that would not serve the cause as greatly as the complete education of 1 million, or 50 per cent education of 50 million?

"Determinists" will violently dispute this as ridiculous to talk of—teaching economics to the masses; but I refuse to guess on how we are to get the majority action we must have—or when. I know the way I would choose if I were made dictator; but I refuse (any longer) to rely on our educators, key men, leaders, literate or intelligentsia.

Then shall I be a "know nothing," pessimist or fatalist? No, until shown otherwise, I shall reduce economics to their simplest form, put them into plainest terms, associate them with the best known events, facts, and persons; and then give them widest circulation.

My theory, being first, that in going after simplicity, doubtless the fullest truth will be reached, and that this may, contrary to prevailing modes, after all, be the best method also for all the hithers.

I suspect that our aim at the mass mind may just about hit the powerful university, captains of industry mind.

* * *

The Jones and Laughlin Strike has been quite quickly settled, which quickness seems to be a habit in the steel business, and perhaps I should say it has also developed in the automobile business; and I expect to see it strongly out-crop in the coal business. We might call these settlements the "grand conspiracy" between union labor and its employer, to pass to the consumer all the tragic cost of their economic ignorance, or duplicity. To protect monopoly, that now directly and indirectly takes about half of the wages of both capital and labor, they mutually agree to charge monopoly's stealings to that patient packhorse, the mass of American consumers. The increased wage is immediately put into increased steel prices.

* * *

Many residents of Greater New York have forgotten the existence of the Third Avenue Railway, which the papers now tell them has 4,500 employees, that are just now the entering wedge in a labor movement that will affect about 50,000 transport workers of the metropolis. That trolley cars are soon to be a thing of the past is

proven everywhere except in Brooklyn and Philadelphia where, I imagine, they are being sustained by a bad combination of politics and frenzied finance. "Good riddance," we say; and yet these remnants of the past including the "L" roads, if they could be dehydrated, would give us cheap transportation.

* * *

Governor Murphy of Michigan is supposed to have won great laurels in settlement of perhaps the greatest strike of history, and now he is in search of other laurels, for example, Presidency (yes, of the U. S. A.) or anyway, laurels as an economist and publicist. Speaking to the Consumers League, a socialistic "group," he makes some very profound statements about the rights of labor, the like of which I have never read in the works of great economists such as Adam Smith or Henry George. For example, he does not hesitate to mix such elements as property and jobs and apply the same man-made laws of control to them.

* * *

The Young Republicans of New York State are meeting in Syracuse full of hope for a comeback; and I have scanned the report of the proceedings for encouraging signs of a real appraisal of their situation and application of remedies. Doubtless some of these young men remember when New York State was the Republican stronghold of the nation, and some of them should be able to figure out why New York Republicanism had lost the confidence of the voters, to a bag of tricks like the New Deal. And if a few of them would agree to stand by their discoveries and throw over the old man of the sea, monopoly, they might win.

* * *

The delirium of the Coronation seems to have been sufficiently exploited even in this land of freedom from both monarchy and snobbery, 3,000 miles away. So I will only comment on one or two "side issues." I wonder how many, the world over, and especially of the London crowds thought more of Duke Edward and his Wally, than they did of all the rest of it. And I wonder how much the hold these two have upon the popular imagination had to do with the Duke's visit to the East Side slums of London and his frank statement that something ought to be done about it. And how much it is fair to contrast this with the new King's fealty to the English traditional favor for the landlords of England, to the exclusion of the masses, from their own soil. This cynicism was voiced by Lloyd George twenty years ago, by Viscount Snowden recently, and many other great English statesmen.

* * *

Henry Ford has 150,000 "hired men;" and he has the right idea of their relationship to him and their jobs. Ford also has the independence and fighting quality, essential to making new history on the labor problem, if associated with his "right idea" he also had some of the same quality of science, that he has always relied on in every department of his business, other than the labor department. Ford is now up against what he very properly calls the "labor monopoly," and he is so far fighting it with a very persuasive statement of "Fordism." Now if he will mount this statement on the solid background of scientific economics, he can stand on it; otherwise New Deal unionism will undoubtedly lick him as they have his competitors, who have settled on the opportunist basis.

* * *

The President, after using the Gulf of Mexico for a new fishing hole for several weeks, has accumulated new confidence, if not new wisdom; and he proposes to hold the New Deal line and not back down—on the Court, Labor Law, power, AAA, or anything else. Is the President to be blamed for this confidence and determination? What, otherwise, did 27 million votes mean. The President's position here seems as strong as it was in sending to the universities for his brain trust. Now in both cases we, the people, are betrayed, not by our President, nor by the Administration, or the brain trust members, nor by Congress; nor, in fact, by the voters. We are betrayed by our system of education. First that system betrayed us in sending to the President people like Tugwell, Moley, and Wallace, fully educated in Marxism and ignorant of sound Jeffersonian economics. And now that system gives us the "public sentiment" that justifies the President in all his brain trust, socialistic plans.

Economics as Taught by the Professors

OR

CONFUSION WORSE CONFOUNDED

IN a recent number of *Harper's Magazine* Professor Edward L. Thorndike of Columbia University had an article entitled "The Psychology of the Profit Motive," Professor Henry Pratt Fairchild of New York University wrote a reply to this article and it appeared in the December number of the magazine in the Personal and Otherwise Department.

The burden of Prof. Fairchild's complaint is that Prof. Thorndike has not been careful in his use of words. He has not defined his terms—in short, he has used the term "profit motive" in a manner that does not meet the approval of Prof. Fairchild.

Prof. Fairchild says that Prof. Thorndike uses the term with a "breadth and vagueness" that no leader of importance in any movement to abolish profits would recognize or accept. He himself claims that the term as used in significant and active discussions of today has a definite and restrictive meaning, but that Prof. Thorndike confuses it with two entirely distinct motives—the acquisitive motive and the pecuniary motive.

The definite and restrictive meaning to which Prof. Fairchild refers is the income from the mere ownership of business. He says that even "the fuzziest-minded economist" would not admit that profits include wages, salaries, revenues—in fact money income of all sorts. So he proceeds to make the whole matter clear as follows:

All income may be divided into two great categories, (1) income that is derived from doing something and (2) income that is derived from owning something.

Ownership income in a modern capitalistic society has three forms, land rent, interest, and returns from the

ownership of business. (Returns from the ownership of business is an obsession with Prof. Fairchild.) He says that this is an idea "still so inadequately comprehended by economists that we have no standard word for it."

The income that is derived from doing something includes wages, salaries, and the earnings of professionals and purveyors of various services that are socially valued. Of course Georgeists call all of these incomes wages and that is what Prof. Fairchild evidently means, but to so designate them would be unprofessorial. He contents himself with declaring that there is not one single important social movement that proposes to abolish doership income, that is, wages, or any important section of it.

In regard to income derived from ownership Prof. Fairchild says that some social uplifters would allow various kinds and degrees of rent, and that some would even allow interest, but that all would wipe out, root and branch, the income that is derived from the ownership of business, for that is the "only true profit."

A profitless economy, the result of wiping out Prof. Fairchild's "only true profit," would intensify the stimulus to industry, the supposition being that the receipt of an income for mere ownership if large enough makes all economic activity unnecessary—it completely destroys the incentive to industry.

Then Prof. Fairchild makes a statement that is unassailable from our standpoint: "In a society where the only normal basis for receiving an income was rendering some socially valuable service, the stimulus to economic effort would be raised to the maximum."

But he has forgotten that he made his own definition of profit, "the only true profit" the income derived from the ownership of business. So a profitless economy that would intensify the stimulus to industry would be an economy devoid of income received for the mere ownership of business but since rent would still go into the pockets of the owner of land an income could still be obtained for the rendering of no socially valuable service, so the stimulus to industry would not be intensified very much, if any. All that would be necessary for a suitable income would be to get hold of land that industry could not do without and collect from those compelled to use it in order to live.

So what boots it for a so-called authority on economics to criticise a professor of psychology for not restricting himself to the narrow meaning of a term when he himself speaks with breadth and vagueness of profitless economics and income from ownership of business?

Professor Thorndike makes the retort courteous in the same number of *Harper's* by agreeing that Prof. Fairchild is correct in saying that he has used the term profit in a much broader sense than income from the ownership of business, that in as much as the idea of this sort of income is so inadequately comprehended by economists that we have no standard word for it; it would not have been wise to have written an article on the psychology