

comments on the speeches made at the Conference from the same versatile pen. The Henry George fundamentalists were not without their friends at this gathering.

The pamphlet contains the declaration of principles of the Commonwealth Land party. It should be widely circulated as propaganda.

J. D. M

#### EXPOSING THE MODERN "BUSINESS" FRAUD.

[Your Money's Worth. By Stuart Chase and F. I. Schlink. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. City.]

Backed by the newspapers and popular magazines, the American manufacturing and commercial interests have for a generation been chorusing the praises of the great god Efficiency, who, they declare, has wrought wondrous works in producing and distributing commodities. Secured in the possession of a market of more than 100,000,000 consumers by a high protective tariff law that shuts out to a great extent foreign goods, the managers of trade and industry have formed a Mutual Admiration Society, dedicated to extolling the beneficent operations of "Free Competition" in the business world. How far their picture of great executives, masters of efficiency, ably serving the public's needs, differs from the reality, is to some degree told in this exposure of the humbug, fraud, incompetence, ignorance and dishonesty, that permeates so much of the American business public today.

The simple truth about a very large percentage of modern goods production and sale is: that blatant advertising exploitation, used to push the sale of shoddy and inferior merchandise, has replaced the old-fashioned reliable articles sold on their merits. What the authors of this book seem to see but dimly is the fact that the problem they deal with is but a small point of the great world-wide question: "Why does production so far outrun consumption?" If Messrs. Chase and Schlink know the relation of this query to the monumental humbug of profiteering and advertising exploitation of the ignorant consumer, they must know that they are merely criticising symptoms of a diseased social organism, for which a radical remedy is needful.

For the money spent on the thousand-and-one trashy articles forced upon the foolish public by dishonest advertising, the dupes of "crooked business" get something. For the billions of dollars paid as ground rents to the lords of the earth's surface the workers of the world get: nothing but permission to live and toil. Here would seem to be an issue really worth while investigating. Have the authors of "Your Money's Worth" the courage to tackle it?

—WHIDDEN GRAHAM.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### PUBLIC COLLECTION OF THE FULL RENT OF LAND

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM and I am a firm believer in the doctrine of the Single Tax.

However, there is a point upon which I am not clear and I need "more light."

Under the heading "What LAND AND FREEDOM stands for" you state: "Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land." That is absolutely correct when applied to the tenant on a farm. He expects to pay rent, and whether that is called rent or tax is immaterial to him, there has been no injustice to him.

But here comes the point:—Suppose I am an attorney owning a good farm, but I live in my own home at the County Seat, earning at the practice of my profession enough of an income to nicely support myself and wife and children. But there comes a time when by accident or disease, I am incapacitated from practicing my profession, and my

income from that source is ended. The rent from my farm is sufficient to support myself and family, in addition to my payment of all taxes. Now suppose that all of my rent from my farm is taken for public purposes, which would leave my family and myself as objects of charity. Have I been given a square deal?

Kindly advise me on this phase of the Single Tax.  
Cincinnati, Ohio.

FRANK G. WHITE.

REPLY: The justification for taking the rent of land for public purposes is that land is not justly the subject of private ownership. The rent of a piece of land used for a farm is due, as the rent of a city lot is due, not to the labor of the owner but to the social and economic advantages which its possession confers. To this neither Mr. White as owner nor Mr. Black as tenant is entitled. All that either is entitled to is a return to his labor or interest on his capital—EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM.

### THE CONTROL OF FLOODS ON THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The system of levees adopted by the U. S. Government in its attempt to control the water of the Mississippi seems to be a copy of the dykes used on the River Po in Italy. The great defect of this system is that as the water of a flood recedes, the sediment is deposited on the bottom of the river and the bed is continually raised, necessitating a constant raising of the dykes.

At the present time the bed of the Po is said to be considerably higher than the valley through which it flows. It would seem that it is only a question of time when the Po will break its dykes and overflow the valley as it has before. This communication is an attempt to outline a rational system for the control of the waters of the Mississippi. Briefly the system would consist of dredging a deep narrow channel in the bed of the river, and moving the present levees two or three miles back from the margin of the river. The dimensions of the deep channel should be calculated so that at a low stage of water, the velocity should be sufficient to carry away any sediment that would be deposited during high water. This channel should be deep enough to float any ocean going steamer and the material moved would be transported by water through pipes to the new levees back from the river.

Chicago might hold its present position by completing the deep water-channel from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi. The best location for a commercial city is as far inland as deep water can be secured, and when it is surrounded by a productive county. Very few of the great marts of the world are situated directly on the sea-coast. The material in the existing levees would be transported by construction trains to the site of the new levees and added to the material taken from the deep channel.

The space between the river and the levees would be annually overflowed, and after the subsidence of the water would be planted with suitable crops. The strip of land bordering the river on both sides would probably, with its favorable climate, be about the most productive land in the world. It would automatically be fertilized and irrigated annually. This kind of irrigation has been practised for centuries in the valleys of the Nile, the Euphrates and the Tigris. In Arabia, Syria and Turkey after the temporary water-courses or (wadys) run dry, the ground is ploughed and planted to crops which mature with the one irrigation. This strip of land is entirely unsuited for private ownership. All titles should be secured by the Government and the land rented to users.

The work should be begun at the mouth of the River, and while the work is in progress the existing levees above the completed sections would afford the same protection as they do now. Below the completed sections, the levees along the tributaries of the main river would remain untouched, as the deepening of the navigation channel and the widening of the water-way between the levees would so reduce the height of the floods that the existing levees along these tributaries would afford ample protection.