

furnished contributory causes to his conversion to a life of service. Something, too, of rare intellectual capacity in the young man himself made the influence of Henry George inescapable. The moral implications of the great philosophy of social reconstruction set forth by the author of "Progress and Poverty" fell upon fertile ground. The young advocate became the intellectual and spiritual child of the great teacher whose influence has enrolled a growing army of distinguished adherents, of whom Samuel Seabury is not the least.

All this the writer of this "life" has told—and he has told it well. In the present flair for biography this work should have a large circle of readers, and it well deserves it. Despite the introduction of many pages of the testimony before the Hofstadter committee, most of which is familiar to us who have read the newspapers, we cannot regard this as "padding," since it must be new to many readers, and its permanent preservation between covers is not undesirable.

There are many interesting incidents related which we do not wish to anticipate for the readers. We want to comment on Mr. Seabury's command of English. He has a style remarkable for its force and clarity. We do not have to stop to ask what he means. He is both eloquent and simple. And he is bold to the degree of being on occasions very unflattering. Even when a candidate for office he said: "We have in our court of last resort some altogether estimable gentlemen whose views upon social, economic and industrial questions would have been somewhat behind the times if they had lived in the time of Columbus." A rather neatly packed sentence.

This work bears evidence of having had cooperation between the author and subject. There are revelations of intimate contact which help to fill out the engaging picture of a remarkable man. Judge Seabury's tastes and cultural recreations as well as the ideals he holds are indicated in many pages. The author has an intense admiration for him, but he does not allow this to betray him into hyperbole. Refraining from words of praise, he reveals his hero worship less by his words than by his attitude, for he does not overemphasize the merits of his hero. It is only in the concluding paragraph that he permits himself to say:

"Samuel Seabury comes then as a radiant challenge to youth to arm itself with convictions; to remain steadfast to its ideals; to hold its faith that there can be here in truth a government of the people, by the people, for the people."

And this is indeed so. Though we have had occasion to differ with Judge Seabury on more than one occasion—which differences we need not stop to indicate—we have watched his career with satisfaction. He is one of the men in public life whose ideals are derived from the great man who has touched more than a few with his prophetic glow. We refer to Henry George.

J. D. M.

ANOTHER AUTHOR WITH A "SOLUTION" *

This book has one grave disadvantage. Composed as it is of pamphlets and addresses written by Mr. Klein at various times, there is much repetition.

It is a plea for the limitation of great fortunes. Even the Rockefeller Foundations, which at least are directed to useful purposes, are to be levied upon. "This book will cure hard times," the cover tells us. The author even hints that a war may be necessary to bring about the readjustment aimed at. We might comment on the superficial character of the work, as shown by such comments as the following on page 79:

"We have reached a stage where the industrial fortunes completely overshadow land fortunes, where money control has produced mental and moral debasement and where the poor are in a worse plight than Henry George pictures. The inequality is more extreme and the structure of government has been changed from democracy to plutocracy or money oligarchy. The condition which Henry George pictures has

been far extended in intensity, and for that reason a radical cure is needed."

If there is any really great fortune which is not based primarily on the inequality that results from the divorcement of man from the land, we do not know of it. The Rockefeller fortune, which is referred to often by the author of this book, would largely disintegrate were land values taken by the people. Railroads, oil wells and pipe lines are *land*, and the Rockefeller fortune was built up by private ownership in these resources, and public utilities based on land. Every great fortune would be severely hit by the so-called Single Tax (inadequate name) more severely indeed than even by the form of "capital levy" Mr. Klein suggests. For that reform would forever prevent their rebuilding. For those fortunes that rest on patent monopoly, which are not of great significance, other preventive measures might be applied.

J. D. M.

Correspondence

DEFENDS PROHIBITION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Please let me take exception to the way Mr. Henry Ware Allen handles prohibition in your March-April number. On page 57 he gives two causes for the present depression. If we accept it as he wrote it we might think that all free soilers were wet, and I know one who is not. The statement that it was "put over" on the American people would seem to carry its condemnation of the methods used. A long, hard fight for prohibition was waged before the World War started. It was probably a necessary measure like the seizing of the railroads to conquer the enemy.

Mr. Allen must assume that the absent soldier vote was wet. I do not think he knows. I was a soldier in another war, and I am not on the liquor side. The revenue that the government lost by that measure should not disturb free landers, for they know that the people's revenue is the nation's land rent. If we collected our ground rent the expense of enforcing prohibition, or the effort to defeat it, would be negligible.

I will not admit that it is unenforceable. What becomes of the sovereignty of a nation of sovereigns if we cannot enforce our laws? Readily will I grant that a government of landlord racketeers are hardly competent to enforce that or any other of our penal statutes. However, we will not always have landlord masters. My opinion is that prohibitionists, like Georgists, want better government, and to that degree we are natural allies. Let us hope that Mr. Allen and others will answer this, for it may be well to learn where Single Taxers stand on the matter of alcohol. Are the laws against theft, burglary kidnapping enforced any better than is prohibition?

Cordele, Ga.

HOWELL CLOPTON HARRIS.

RENT—COST—PRICE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Anent the current discussion in your columns of the relation between Rent—Cost—Price:

In contending that rent does not increase price it might be well to explain to one's opponent a certain feature which frequently, and quite naturally, is his stumbling block. It is obvious that if the seller is paying rent that on the average amounts to 5 per cent of the value of the goods sold, and that if the owner of the site occupied should remit this rent charge, the goods *could* be sold for 5 per cent less.

Thus, reasons said opponent, rent has increased price to the extent of 5 per cent. Then we start at the other end and demonstrate with a few words and figures that rent does *not* enter into price.

The seeming contradiction disappears when we recognize that the suggested remission of rent would be merely a gift from the landlord to the seller of the goods, his tenant, which would *enable* the tenant

*America, Use Your Head. By Henry H. Klein: 12mo; 192 pages. Published by the author.