

November—December, 1928

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Further Proceedings of the
Henry George Congress

The Economics of Moses

Clayton J. Ewing

Natural Law

Henry H. Hardinge

Honest Farm Relief

(Concluding Paper)

Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown

Fighting for Fundamentals

J. C. Lincoln

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

Digitized by Microsoft®

LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York

JAMAICA OFFICE, 72 Johnson Avenue, Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 305 Broadway, New York City

OSCAR H. GEIGER, Treas., 150 Nassau St., N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 165 Broadway, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading rooms, \$1.00. Club subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1928

VOL. XXVIII

No. 6. WHOLE No. 151

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.

AUSTRALIA: Percy R. Meggy, Sydney, New South Wales.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington

URUGUAY: Dr. Felix Vitale, Montevideo.

SPAIN: Antonio Albendin, Cadiz.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

HUNGARY: Prof. Robt. Braun, Budapest.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade, Av. Pal Legislativo 40, Mexico City.

INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	163
PROGRESS IN ENGLAND.....	164
THE OHIO SINGLE TAX ASSOCIATION RE-BORN.....	165
THE ECONOMICS OF MOSES..... Clayton J. Ewing	165
FIGHTING FOR FUNDAMENTALS..... J. C. Lincoln	167
ADDRESS OF PROF. F. W. ROMAN.....	168
THE LAND QUESTION IN BRITISH POLITICS Mathew Warriner	169
HONEST FARM RELIEF (CONCLUDING PAPER) Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown	171
THE COMING INTERNATIONAL SINGLE TAX CONFER- ENCE.....	174
DEATH OF WARREN WORTH BAILEY.....	175
CAN WE PROMOTE PROSPERITY..... Chas. H. Ciliske	177
EMPLOYMENT AND PROSPERITY Grace Isabel Colbron	178
NATURAL LAW..... Henry H. Hardinge	180
FORERUNNERS OF HENRY GEORGE..... A. P. Canning	182
BOOK NOTICES	187
CORRESPONDENCE	189
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	189

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product.

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXVIII

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1928

No. 6

Comment and Reflection

THOSE who reflect upon the trend of modern education may well be arrested by this from Everett Dean Martin's "The Meaning of a Liberal Education," page 68:

"In the library of a very up-to-date writer on sociological and economic subjects, I did not find a single book, except a few school texts, written before nineteen hundred." Then he goes on to comment: "Modern writers all seem to desire to express the movement of the day. But it is difficult to see how one's judgment of the present can be very sound, if one has no background of the cultural traditions of the race."

AS there are few works of importance dealing with political economy and social problems written since 1900 we need not be surprised at the neglect of fundamental discussion on these questions and the fact that Henry George is relegated to the top shelf in college and university libraries, or not considered at all. No wonder Nicholas Murray Butler is provoked into saying in his Annual Report for 1924:

"The costly, ineffective, and even demoralizing character of much contemporary school and college work is due to the fact that so many of those who conduct it can neither look back down the road over which mankind has come nor forward along the road over which mankind is moving."

IN his Annual Report for 1926 President Butler again says:

"Today there is a New Philistia. They are the proud discoverers and possessors of a doctrine of behavior which finds nothing to behave and no purpose in behaving. Where they have touched education—and they have touched and are touching it at many points—they are reducing it to a costly pantomime. They are the blind leading the blind, as well as no inconsequential part of the cause of those intellectual, moral, social and political ills which afflict modern man and which greatly multiply the difficulties of carrying forward a constructive and a progressive civilization."

EVERETT DEAN MARTIN in the work just quoted from says on page 89:

"One should learn to hold all one's beliefs with a half-amused lightheartedness. Most minds are loaded down with the seriousness of their convictions. Solemnity in the presence of our eternal verities is awkwardness, and

makes us always a little ridiculous, giving us the appearance of one about to shake hands with the President. Why not enjoy the humor of the situation? Our great truths may all the while be "spoofing" us. It will do no harm to give them a sly wink now and then."

Nothing (not even Single Tax) is to be taken seriously. Also p. 125: "I have heard a young man say with a note of defiance, 'Yes, sir, I'm a Single Taxer and I'm proud of it.' So involved is the ego in our dilemmas that we often require the assistance of a specialist in getting over them."

IS it any wonder that seriously minded men are beginning to distrust our educators and modern systems of education. Writing some time ago in the *New York Times Magazine* Evans Clark says:

"Five or ten years ago undergraduate dissent had a distinctly economic tinge. Radicalism in the colleges was a favorite subject for academic excursions of alarmed investigators, in and out of official position. But today it is not economic and social change that has captured the imagination of the dissentient minority. It is something far more sophisticated, far more worldlywise. Socialism has given place to Menckanism: assertion to negation, political enthusiasm to the religion of militant cynicism. As one experienced radical campaigner in the colleges put it Scott Fitzgerald is more revered than Scott Nearing in undergraduate circles of the intellectual elite. Apparently economic and political radicalism has fled from the flippant milieu of the undergraduates, to the more earnest atmosphere of the theological seminary and the Y. M. C. A."

THE election is over and there is not much to say of it.

The contest was little more important, as Will Rogers has reminded us, in the consideration of any issues that affect the well-being of the people, than the latest base ball game. The Democratic party abandoning its old traditions on the tariff sought to establish its resemblance to the Republican party so that the two might be indistinguishable. It will be hard for it to reverse itself four years from now when such reversal will be necessary. Undoubtedly thousands of free traders and low tariff men were alienated from its support in this election. Norman Thomas, as the candidate of the re-born Socialist party, made a dignified campaign, and on a number of occasions emphasized the taxation of land values, which issue he made his own. As the leader of a new liberal party Mr. Thomas may in the future loom large.

Progress in England

THE City Council of Sheffield, Eng., has approved a report favoring a tax on the unimproved value of land made by Councillor A. Barton. Under the existing system in England, the local taxes (or "rates") on land depend on its annual income, so that idle or poorly improved land pays very little. The Report points out that this system encourages the holding of land idle for speculation, "restricts employment and causes poverty," and adds:

"A tax on the capital or selling value of land would compel its owner to rent, sell, or make the best use of the land he possessed, as he could not afford to pay rates without getting a return. It would thus throw land on the market and reduce the price. It would be an encouragement to enterprise and promote greater opportunities of employment.

* * * * *

"Apart from the point that land was created by no one and that any value due to it, apart from improvement, should belong to the community rather than the individual, it is obviously only fair that those who reap the benefit of communal improvements and the value given by the growth of a city in population and trade, should be the chief contributors to the cost of public benefactions and amenities."

The Report also calls attention to the fact that

"The Advisory Committee set up in 1926 by the Chairman of the Parliamentary Labor Party, to consider the Land Question, reported as follows:—

(1) An effective Land Valuation Department be re-established and a National Land Valuation be put in hand. This valuation should be public and should include all land and minerals. It should show (a) the unimproved or site value, and (b) the total value of land, and improvements. The valuation should be kept up to date, and all land should be re-valued at least once every five years.

(2) A National flat rate Land Tax at the rate of 1d. in the £ be imposed on the unimproved (or site) value, whether the land is used or not. . . . The Tax should be collected from the owners, either directly or by deduction from rent. Provision should be made for charging part of the tax upon lessees where these enjoy an element of land value.

(3) Local Authorities should be given the power to levy a local flat rate of any amount on all Land Values within their area. This Rate to be either in partial, or complete substitution for the present rates, and to be paid by the owners of empty houses, or unused land just as by those owners who are using their property.

(4) The Land Value Taxation which we propose should be regarded, primarily, as a means of (a) collecting the economic rent for the community; (b) deflating land values and so cheapening land; (c) promoting the improvement

and the most profitable use of land; and (d) facilitating the acquisition of land by Public Authorities."

The Civilization of Tonga

UNDER Great Britain's protection the Tongas have the only native kingdom in the Pacific. * * * *

They do not have even the comic opera's army of two soldiers and a general. There is no army. There is no Tongan navy, not a fort or a gun. * * * * The kingdom of Tonga is odd among the nations in other respects. It has no taxes of any sort * * * no income tax * * no public debt; instead a surplus of eighty thousand pounds sterling is in the royal treasury?

Whence comes the revenue?

From the world's only complete system of ground rents. There is no freehold in the kingdom. Everybody who occupies land pays rent to the government. Not a foot of land can be bought or sold in the Friendly Islands. * * *

This is the Tonga's country. They know it, they feel it, and they show it in their bearing. Not that they are overbearing, they merely give a distinct impression that they are standing on their own ground. * * * The British Consul exercises a fatherly care over native affairs under the advice of the British High Commissioner in Fiji, who is appointed by the King. Further to assist in this altruistic work the Chief Justice, Auditor General, Minister of Public Works, and Treasurer are Britishers, as are also the Post and Customs officials. These constitute the British Protectorate. A native parliament furnishes the political fireworks. * * *

Kolomotua is typical of most Tonga villages. The oval, grass-roofed native houses are scattered about irregularly, but with plenty of ground room, * * * the grass trimmed down, and the grounds free from rubbish. Tongan and Samoan villages are as neat as any thriving villages in our own United States. * *

Every male Tongan in his sixteenth year is allotted about eight acres of cocoanut land and a little plot in his village. * * These of course he cannot sell—and he must pay rent, whether he wants the land or not. * *

Land rent, extra clothing, the demands of the church and the cost of boards and corrugated roofing, if their tastes happen to run that way—these compel the Tongans to make an appreciable amount of copra * * —their allotments assure plenty of cocoanut. Even at that they work only a small fraction of the time at copra making.

Tongans will put in an incredible amount of labor on anything that serves directly their own ends."

"Loafing Through The Pacific" By S. M. HUMPHREY.

WHERE Goethals wrought in energy aflame
Let Gorgas raise an equal plea for fame;
Who from the pest-house and the evil fen
Conjured a breathing paradise for men.
From *Panama and Other Poems* by STEPHEN PHILLIPS.

The Ohio Single Tax Association Reborn

A GATHERING of Single Taxers to effect an organization in the state of Ohio met at Columbus, at the Neil House on October 13. The meeting was small but very active. For the first time in my experience there was no hair splitting. Nor was there any hair-pulling.

An election resulted in myself as president, Mr. W. A. Ruprecht, of Columbus, vice-president, and Mr. J. H. Kauffman, of Columbus, as secretary and treasurer.

Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow of Cincinnati introduced the following resolution:

RESOLVED that the Ohio Single Tax Association concentrate on home rule in taxation, including the right of cities to adopt the so-called "Pittsburgh Plan."

This was adopted without a dissenting vote.

Rev. Bigelow now introduced a resolution based on his remarks at the recent Henry George Memorial Congress at Chicago. The resolution was as follows:

"RESOLVED that it is the sense of this meeting that those who favor the taxation of land values, the public ownership of public utilities, old age pensions, and concerted action for world disarmament, should make common cause by the formation of an organization to carry on educational work for the four proposals; and also to investigate the views of all legislative candidates at primaries and general elections, and to urge voters to discriminate in favor of candidates sincerely committed to these proposals."

In the discussion, which was very short, one man asked if the author of the resolution did not think that under a Single Tax regime old age pensions would be unnecessary. They probably will be, but as the Single Tax is not just round the corner and coming like a movie villain, there will be much ameliorative work to do in mitigating the pangs of poverty. It might be emphasized that elderly victims of a bad social system should be compensated by a tax laid on land value. It is to be hoped that such a scheme will please the members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, who are behind the old age pension proposition.

Long ago Prof. Richard T. Ely advocated the socialization of natural monopolies. Single Taxers should readily take up with the idea of public ownership of public utilities. Municipal Ownership Leagues have among them many who might be brought to see that the greatest of all the natural monopolies is land.

To urge that land grabbing and tariffs are the main causes of war is heterodoxy to the average legislator. He therefore draws on the passion and patriotism of youth. The young men of the land should be especially keen to submit a questionnaire to candidates for legislatures. We are prone to ask what the legislator is going to do or what he thinks about a certain thing *after* election; seldom do we ask *before*.

It seems to me that this programme of the Ohio Single Tax Association, namely, to cooperate with libertarian groups, will redound to the cause of freedom.

We are apt to blame the "Ruralites," or as they have been designated in Ohio, "The Cornstalk League," with much conservatism in taxation matters. But what shall we say when cities in a state bordering on Pennsylvania know little or nothing of Pittsburgh's plan?

It is one of my pet theories that a committee of Single Taxers appearing in person before legislative bodies, whether city councils, state representatives or directors of a business, can make an impression. Such crusaders will come with no personal requests. They will spend their own money in seeking an audience. Their sincerity and intellectuality should carry weight. With this idea I appointed a large group to be known as the "Legislative Committee." It may be that such a committee will cooperate with the proponents of plans mentioned in the Bigelow resolution. At any rate, such a committee will be ready to confer with legislative committees when subjects pertaining to taxation are to be discussed.

MARK MILLIKIN, M. D.

President Ohio Single Tax Association.

The Economics of Moses

ADDRESS OF CLAYTON J. EWING,
HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, SEPT. 11

IN the life, character and writings of Moses we perceive a God of Justice and Truth—of infinite power and wisdom—a God who desired the inhabitants of the earth to learn His ways and His laws and follow His guidance, and thus bring the Kingdom of God on earth. This condition was to be brought about by working in harmony with natural law, not by violating it, and so individually proceed in an endless evolution or development to higher faculties, enlarged powers, greater opportunities and responsibilities. When duly and truly prepared other fields and duties would open to us.

To the Jews for many centuries, and to the Christian world, whether Catholic or Protestant, Moses has been regarded as a hero. To the reasoning mind Moses makes a stirring appeal. He is known as the great Law Giver. Law is the perfection of logic. The natural universe is one of Law and Order.

Moses is the great Law Giver, not alone because he gave us the Ten Commandments. Other laws not so prominently taught, which the world does not yet understand or practise, the world must some day learn to obey. The points to which I desire to call attention are very, very old and have been long overlooked—buried in oblivion in the rubbish of the temple.

The Promised Land—the land in which to carry out the new idea of social righteousness! The Covenant, reiterated and confirmed to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob! How often the phrase occurs—"Unto the and

which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and, Unto the Seed of Abraham for an Inheritance." In the Promised Land and in this new nation these economic laws were to be given a trial.

You will recall how Jacob and his sons went down to Egypt and how Jacob was prime minister to Pharaoh and the Jews were settled in the land of Goshen—near or in the Delta of the Nile—until the Shepherd Kings were overthrown and new Pharaohs ruled who knew not Joseph and were hostile to the Jews.

And as the land of Egypt had gotten into the ownership of Pharaoh, the Jews were slaves and their burdens grievous. But they were increasing in numbers, so orders were sent out to kill the male infants in order to keep down the population—and into this situation Moses was born.

Adopted by Pharaoh's daughter, raised in luxury, taught no doubt the traditions of his people, the promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—the Promised Land. Reared as a prince, one who might some day occupy Egypt's throne—in all the world of that day no prouder eminence—he chose not to be called the son of Pharaoh, but selected rather the lineage of his own despised and down-trodden race.

He married the daughter of a Midian priest. He knows the religion of Midian and of Egypt; he knows the land laws of Egypt—the laws that made slaves of the people. He knows the democracy of the desert—the equality that grows up where all have equal access to the land. He is versed in the knowledge of the Egyptians—and is the best equipped man of his time. There is probably no man better fitted to establish a nation on lines of economic justice. He has knowledge, the ability and the vision—has he also the faith? That strange quality, Faith!

He cares nothing for power or fame or applause. He is content; he likes the life in Midian, with quiet and comfort and time for study. And then the burning bush that burns and is not consumed!

He organizes the Jewish men by fifties and hundreds so they can be handled by associate leaders. And with great difficulty he gets them to travel through the wilderness. He announces the renewal of the Covenant, they arrive at the borders of the Promised Land. But their faith fails them and they surrender to fear. How shall men so long economic slaves be made into heroes?

But forty years pass—the generation of slaves die in the wilderness and a new generation has arisen who knew not the lash of the taskmaster. And now Moses has an army of men—not cringing slaves.

Consider the great tasks of Moses:

To lead them out of the house of bondage;

To establish a military system and an army;

To establish a religious system based on the idea of one spiritual God;

To establish them as a nation dwelling in a land of fixed habitation. The nation to be not a Kingdom but a democracy;

To provide a system of laws under which the government could continue to exist and function along national lines.

The Hebrew nation was not to remain exclusively for those in whom ran the blood of Jacob, but the laws of Moses and his ideals were to reign supreme in the mind and heart of individual and the nation. But it was to be the melting pot of that age. So the Jewish race today is not a pure-blooded race if by that is meant blood descendants of Jacob without the admixture of outside races.

People say "our country" just because they were born here or happen to live here. This was not the ideal of Moses. The Jews did not say "our country" in referring to Egypt or Babylonia; they were only strangers and sojourners therein. Every Jew of the twelve tribes was to be part owner of the Promised Land of Canaan and to have his individual allotment therein. The Levites were not allotted land but they were given special tasks. They and the Priests were to be the school teachers, the instructors, the board of health, the administrative, ecclesiastical and judicial arm of government, and they were supported by taxation, by the tithe levied on the other land owning Jews.

Moses was determined that the Jewish workingman should not be landless, hence the provision that every Jew (except the Levites) should have a right to and ownership in the land. He saw the importance of this if the other Jews did not. So he provided the year of Jubilee. Every fiftieth year—or after 7 periods of 7 years each, the land reverted back to the original family as the heirs. He enjoined them: "The land shall not be sold forever; The profit of the earth is for all; Every man shall sit under his own vine and fig tree."

He put these laws into a book and he instructed that it be preserved beside the Ark. And he provided that it be trumpeted (Leviticus 25-10) "And he shall hallow the 50th year and proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a Jubilee unto you and ye shall return every man unto his family. A jubilee shall the 50th year be unto you."

The object of Pentecost was that it be a perpetual reminder of the *gift of the land*; and that every year every male Jew should have his attention called to his absolute *right of inheritance* in the land.

The land system of Moses was suited to the pastoral conditions. It was sufficient that the people's rights in the land could never be alienated and that the expenses of government were provided by the tithe or tax upon the landowners practically. Such a system of land allotments provided more freedom, more justice and more democracy and more opportunity for the common man than any other system in use in the world at that time. If the Hebrew nation had been consistently true to the economic laws of Moses it is likely that it would have become the great nation of antiquity. For his economic laws, providing

justice and freedom and opportunity, would have drawn men and territory into the domain of that system. His law of naturalization for outsiders would have enabled his nation to absorb and assimilate countless millions and the whole course of the world's history would have been changed.

The nation which fifty years hence most nearly approximates to the economic ideals of Moses will be the leading nation of the earth. I am devoutly hopeful that that nation will be the United States where in the city of Philadelphia in 1839 was born the man, Henry George, who later was to announce to the world the economic ideals of Moses adapted to changed conditions but carrying with them the same message of freedom, justice and opportunity to all!

Moses himself had declared, realizing that other leaders and other prophets would be needed, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, like unto me; unto him shall thou hearken."

Thus did the prophet of the Hebrews foretell the coming of the Prophet of San Francisco!

Fighting For Fundamentals

ADDRESS OF J. C. LINCOLN, HENRY GEORGE
CONGRESS, SEPT. 12.

HENRY GEORGE in "Progress and Poverty" after a few hundred pages of the highest kind of research arrived at a momentous conclusion. This conclusion is expressed in the words: "We must make land common property." The rest of the book is an examination of what this change in our economic system would result in; an examination of the improved conditions of labor and capital which would result from this change; and the picture of what society would be like after this change had been introduced.

All of us who are here assembled are here because we believe that Henry George's conclusion was one of the greatest discoveries that was ever made, and that when adopted a new and higher civilization will arise of which we can have no comprehension at the present time.

It is quite clear from many other passages in "Progress and Poverty" that the method which Henry George proposed to use in making land common property for the community was to take ground rent. In one place he says: "that it is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent" to accomplish our purpose.

We are assembled here because we believe most heartily in the assertion of Henry George that all of us have an equal right to the land, and that land is actually common property, but we must realize that in order to use land properly the continuous, exclusive and private possession of land must exist. Private property in land gives this continuous, exclusive and private possession that is necessary to the proper use of land, but does not assert the com-

mon ownership of land which is so necessary, and for which Henry George fought and died.

Our problem is to educate the public in the philosophy of Henry George. It seems to me somewhat unfortunate that the name "Single Tax" should have been adopted so generally as the name of the movement, as this name emphasizes the fiscal side of the proposition rather than the moral side. Most of us are quite sure that slavery was a bad thing for both North and South from the fiscal standpoint. In other words, in a large way slavery did not pay, but I do not think that slavery would ever have been abolished unless the moral side of the slavery question had been brought to the front. In the same way I believe that until we emphasize the moral side of the philosophy of Henry George that we will be unable to invoke the enthusiasm that will be necessary to put our proposition across. It is now forty-nine years since "Progress and Poverty" was printed, and I think that we will all admit that the public's idea of what we have in mind is quite hazy and indefinite and I believe that if the emphasis from the beginning had been placed on collection of ground rent instead of upon taxation of land values that the public's idea of what we have in mind would be clearer than what it is at the present time.

The term "taxation of land values" has been adopted by some of the followers of Henry George in England, and what they really mean is to eventually tax land until there are no values left in it. What they propose at the present time is to take part of the ground rent as we are doing in this country; but, they propose to take only a small part to begin with and an increasing part as the public is educated.

It seems to me that the movement would have progressed further in public understanding if the proposition that we proposed to take ground rent for public purposes and eliminate taxation had been our slogan instead of taking "land values taxation" for our slogan. We all know that both slogans mean the same thing, but I am sure that the public understanding of what we are after would have progressed much further if we had made it clear that what we intended to do was to abolish taxations and take ground rent for public purposes instead of talking about the taxation of land values.

I have a friend who is a real estate salesman and a very fine fellow, who wanted to know what the Single Taxers had in mind, and said he understood that what they proposed to do was to place all taxes on real estate. In his mind there was no distinction between land and buildings. In his mind the whole emphasis of the matter was the manner of taxation and had nothing to do with making land common property. I told him that what the Single Taxers wanted to do was to abolish all taxation, taking ground rent for public purposes.

These few words gave him a clear idea about what we want to accomplish. He was naturally not in favor of

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

of employment and you will see at once that attention is going to be forced upon the land question in England.

The argument has started, and we shall take it up and make it hotter and hotter.

The unemployment question is the land question. You call it poverty; you call it unemployment; it is all the same thing. The trade unions and trade union leaders who are trying to better the condition of their members have misled their members. The trade unions are now being forced to accept reductions in wages.

The Church is still influential in England.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, after a brief consideration of the problems, referred to the depression in England as an industrial blight. "What I think is necessary is a revival of religion." I think he is right about this. If Englishmen would take the religion of Henry George, and give up their privileges in land, they could accomplish much.

We next come to the Tory party—the old responsible party of England. They are a fine bunch. Mr. Baldwin is the cleverest leader they could have selected. But as to the unemployment question; what does he say about it? What does he say about the land question, which they do not like to admit as being the same? He says "I do not know anything about it, and I have never professed to know. If the people want redemption, they must redeem themselves."

Now as to the Liberals. Mr. Lloyd George, who won the war, said that he was going to make England a land fit for heroes. It seems to me you have to be a hero to live in England now.

On occasions when the land question was investigated, research committees said that the land of England belongs to the people. But the land is the gift of the Almighty to less than 1,000 people in England. God has evidently forgotten the other forty million.

The Labor Party is making a very much needed protest against the unequal distribution of the wealth that is being produced in England.

Is there a hint in any of these parties that they begin to know anything about this land question? I cannot discover it. I do not see that they are trying to do anything to solve the problem. Can you look for any help from any of these parties?

It is true that the Liberal Party has been flirting with the Taxation of Land Values for over forty years. But try to look for anything effective, and there is nothing in any of them.

What about the Taxation of Land Values people? They are all good people. Enough has been said as to the injury that has been done to the cause of Henry George by the use of Tax and Taxes. There is no appeal in the Taxation of Land Value at all. It is advisable for you who call yourselves Single Taxers to examine why it is that you have not made more progress.

You point to Australia and say, you have Land Value Taxation there. Actually land monopolies are more firmly entrenched in Australia than ever.

Henry George has not failed. He has never been tried. But Taxation of Land Values will always fail. When you say to a man "Don't you pay your taxes, they are all unnecessary," he will not understand you. Tell him "If you have land pay the rent of it" and he will answer you, "That would suit me fine." The idea is at once clear to him. The truth is that so long as land value taxation is mixed up with taxes on the products of labor, you will have land monopoly, and will have it entrenched for all time.

A few of us got together under the leadership of Mr. Outhwaite, who is a passionate lover of freedom, and we said this attempt to compromise with a principle is bound to fail and the attempt only wastes time. This attempt to get 20% justice is a waste of time. Let us go to the people and say to them, "You have a right to live on earth." Let us go to them and ask them—Will you stand behind us if we go and demand the equal right of every man to the bounties of nature and attack the robbery of taxation?

Do you wonder that, seeing the truth, we decided to go out on our own when we found Mr. Snowden telling the people we are going to buy the land of England for the people of England and it is not going to cost you a penny. How does he explain that? He means to say they are going to pay for it in paper. Well of course it is crooked. I do not like to attribute such motives to people; I really think it is ignorance. Among so much ignorance there is no room for sin.

We mean to go at it definitely and work at it definitely. We will go out for the by-elections. At the expenditure of very little money we will make more impression on the people of England than those of our friends who operate through the Labor, or any other existing party.

Henry George in Andorra

THE oldest republic in the world, Andorra, after 1119 years of freedom has been sold to a gambling syndicate and will be turned into a rival of Monte Carlo. A recent article in the *Boston Globe* says this:

"Early in the present century, a Massachusetts man, Fiske Warren, an ardent Single Tax disciple of Henry George, became interested in Andorra and its marvelous longevity. He declared that the secret of Andorra's success was that there the land was community owned and monopoly could not raise its head. So he settled in Andorra and began to propagate the philosophy of Henry George. This Single Tax colony still thrives. It was the only thing Andorrans ever paid any attention to, from the outside world, until last May, when Parliament decided to issue postage stamps. Till then, any Andorran who wanted to write a letter sent for stamps to France or Spain."

Honest Farm Relief and Fair Taxation

PROF. HARRY GUNNISON BROWN, HENRY
GEORGE CONGRESS, MONDAY, SELT. 10

(Concluded from Sept.-Oct. issue of LAND AND FREEDOM)

WE now come to the fact that our existing tax system penalizes industry and thrift, like the communism which our conservatives pretend to be opposed to but the principle of which, where they are accustomed to it and it benefits their own class, they are quite willing to approve.

The essence of communism lies in the equal sharing in the products of industry without much regard to contribution or efficiency. The larger output of goods produced by the comparatively efficient is, in part, taken from them for the support of the inefficient.

When conservatively-minded persons criticize communistic schemes on any other basis than their own immediate selfish pecuniary interests, their criticism is to the effect that such schemes fail to reward efficiency and thrift, divorce superior service from superior remuneration, and are likely, therefore, not to work well. Yet these same conservatively-minded persons will defend the existing system of taxation—which certainly has large elements of communism—against a system which would penalize much less or not at all any future labor or thrift of any person. Our Federal income tax is certainly, in some degree, communistic. Not only does it take more from those whose hard work and thrift give them larger incomes than the inefficient, wasteful and lazy, but it taxes the former at a much higher rate. Even our state and local property taxes put a greater burden—though not a greater proportionate burden—on those whose efficient work and whose habits of thrift enable them to accumulate capital. If a man saves and improves his property, he must pay more taxes. If he is lazy and thriftless his taxes remain low. If, constructing a great factory, he increases the efficiency of hundreds or thousands of workmen and so adds to the sum of commodities which all may enjoy, he is punished by increased taxes. But if, instead, he keeps a piece of land vacant and unused until the activities of those around him and the growth and development of the community have given it high value; if he then makes money out of what these others have done, requiring the person who would use the land to pay him a high price for advantages of situation for which not his activities but the activities of others are responsible, we keep his taxes relatively low.

On the other hand, a tax on bare-land values which are produced by the growth and activities of the community is clearly not communistic as communism has been above defined. Such a tax would take from the individual only that part of his income for which the community is peculiarly responsible. If his income is larger because the growth

of the community about him enables him to secure a high rent from a favorably situated piece of land, his tax would be higher. But if his income is larger because he works more efficiently than others or because by his thrift he is enabled to build stores, factories or houses or to cover bare acres with fruit trees, his bare land-value tax would be no greater. The rewards of his superior efficiency and of his superior thrift would not be taken from him. His efficiency and his thrift would not be penalized in order that the inefficient, lazy and unthrifty should share, without deserving, in what he has produced.

The intelligent application of this principle to American agriculture would involve the removal of all taxes, not only from farm machinery and buildings but also from the fertility value of the soil in so far as it is built up or maintained by the farmer's work and thrift. For in this connection we must remember that fertility elements put into the soil—and, equally, fertility elements maintained through constant renewal—by a farmer, are, in the economic sense, capital rather than land. In the city we construct capital *on* land. In the country we often put it, largely, *into* the land. Let us reckon as bare-land value, therefore, in the case of agriculture, only that value which the land would have if in large degree exhausted, and consider any greater value which it may have as a result of the care and attention applied to putting it into *or keeping it in* fertile condition, as compared with its "run down" value, to be capital as truly as the buildings, machinery and planted trees upon it. If we really wish not to penalize efficiency, not to penalize thrift, and not to tax as unearned income values which are produced by individuals rather than by nature and society, then we shall wish to arrange that the farmer who builds up *or, even who merely maintains*, the fertility of his land, *shall not have to pay any higher tax than if he kept it in run-down condition* and with no buildings, orchards or other improvements on it.

To tax community-made land values rather than labor and thrift would, in general, give relief to those farmers who most need it. It is not the wealthy owners of prairie land well situated on a concrete highway not far from a railroad station, whether they direct their own operations or live off of the rents paid by tenants, who most need relief. The farmers who most need help (leaving out of consideration, for the present, tenant farmers and farmers so heavily mortgaged as to be almost in the tenant class) are those whose farms yield almost no economic rent and who would, therefore, pay no or almost no tax if only the community-produced economic rent of land were taxed to meet public needs, i. e., if community-produced bare-land values were the sole source or nearly the sole source of taxation.

The bare-land value of a farm is what would be left after subtracting the value of buildings, of fruit trees, of fences, installed drainage, growing crops, tools and machinery, horses and cattle, and *fertility also* in so far

as it has been built up or maintained by fertilization and careful cultivation. A tax on the bare-land value of a farm would therefore be, really, a tax on the "run down" value of land, after the value of all the so-called improvements had been subtracted. Where such "run-down" value is zero, a tax on the bare-land value of the farm, no matter how high the rate of taxation, would be a zero tax!

Another way of expressing the matter is to say that a bare-land-value tax certainly should not take more than the entire *economic* rent, and the entire *economic* rent, in the case of many farms, is *nothing*. For what is *economic* rent? Suppose a man owns a farm which he leases to a tenant by the year. Before we know what is the *economic* rent, we must subtract from the yearly payment made for the farm by the tenant, not only enough to cover depreciation of improvements, but also a reasonable percentage of interest on the value of all improvements, including fruit trees and including the fertility value built up or maintained by fertilization, careful crop rotation, etc. Only the surplus above such interest is *economic* rent or rent of the bare land. A tax on bare-land value could not take anything beyond such economic rent. If it did, it would be a tax on improvements, too, and not just a tax on bare-land value.

Let's look at the matter in still another way. If the owner runs his own farm—i. e., if he is a typical American working farmer—what really is his *economic* rent which is all that would be taxed under a bare-land-value tax? To find what is his economic rent, we must first subtract from his total income as pay for his work, all that he would make as a tenant if someone else owned the farm. Then, second, we must subtract from the remainder enough to cover not only depreciation but also a reasonable percentage return as interest on the value of all improvements. And in these improvements must be counted the fertility value built up or maintained by wise cultivation and proper fertilization. Only what is left after making these subtractions, is economic rent. A tax on this remainder would be a tax on bare-land values. And a tax on bare-land values alone could *not* take *more* than this remainder. A tax taking more than this would not be a tax on bare-land values alone but on improvements also. A bare-land value tax is a tax on the *run-down* value of the land not counting any improvements.

One would think that farmers and farm leaders would devote themselves enthusiastically to putting into effect such a scheme of taxation of bare-land values. For this would be practically no tax at all on a considerable proportion of farmers. Especially in this recent period of agricultural depression when all sorts of nostrums have been advocated to cure the evil, is it not amazing that more farmers have not demanded scientific taxation which would leave them all the wages of their labor and interest on all their improvements, which would tax only their economic rent, if and when they received any, and which would

never penalize them for improving their farms, by raising their taxes?

That many farm owners would most certainly gain if taxes were removed from improvements and concentrated on bare-land values is evident to anyone who will examine the facts. A recent investigation carried on by the Agricultural Experiment Station of the Michigan State College, in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture clearly shows it. Among other data are those showing the proportion of taxes to net property returns on farms surveyed in seven Northern Michigan counties from 1919 to 1925 inclusive. The taxes averaged over 90 per cent. In 1922 they averaged over 150 per cent. It is perfectly obvious that these taxes must have been *very greatly* in excess of the economic rent or return on bare-land value. Since a large part of the return on most farms, besides the wages of labor, is interest on improvements, and only a part, probably a distinctly minor part, is economic rent, how can any one suppose that a tax on economic rent alone would be anything like so burdensome as a tax which, as in this instance, has been taking nearly the whole of both interest and rent?

But perhaps the most important reason for taxing community-made land values rather than other things, and at the same time the most important objection to our present tax system is that the former will make land cheap and the acquisition of ownership relatively easy; whereas our present tax system operates to make land expensive and so tends towards heavy mortgages or towards long and, often, hopeless tenancy.

In order to make this perfectly clear, it is necessary that we distinguish between the conditions determining the value of capital and those determining the value of land. The difference lies in the fact that the value of capital depends upon its cost of production—or of duplication—while the value of land depends solely upon its expected future income. This distinction is, from the point of view of public policy, of the utmost importance. Capital includes all tools of production brought into existence by the effort and thrift of human beings. It includes planted trees and the fertility put into land by the owner's effort and investment or restored and maintained by the owner's care and thrift. The bare-land is a gift of nature. Since capital has to be produced, its value depends on its cost of production, whereas land has no cost of production and its value is dependent solely on its expected future income. Of course the value of capital, also, is related to the prospect of income. An unseaworthy ship does not have high value just because its cost of construction was high, and a railroad built through a desert may have little value despite a high cost of building. Yet in the long run and on the average there is certainly a close relation between the value of capital and its cost. Competition tends to bring about a price for any capital which just about covers the cost of producing it, including in cost the ordinary

"profit" to the producer. Indeed, no one will go on year after year producing capital instruments to sell for less than their cost; and no one, unless he has a monopoly, can go on year after year charging much more.

But the value of land has no relation to any cost of production, since the land was not humanly produced and is not reproducible. The would-be buyer of land asks only how much net return he is likely to be able to make from it. Such an expected net yield is then capitalized at the prevailing rate of interest. However much the community may grow, capital cannot rise in value except as the cost of producing it increases; while land rises in value as and because the community grows and develops, and in proportion as roads, subways, railroads, schools, etc., are built around, through and in it. A business block in the center of a great city is valuable (bare-land value), not because of the activities of those who own that particular piece of land, but chiefly because of the way in which others settle about it. The development of the environing areas enables the owner of that block to enjoy larger rents, and the possibility of enjoying these rents gives the privilege of ownership value and makes the land sell for a high price. Individuals create the values of their capital by saving and constructing the capital. Nature and society create the value of land.

Since the value of land has no relation to any cost of production but depends solely on its expected future rent, a tax on this value which reduces the net rent of land will correspondingly reduce the salable value of the land. Here is a fundamental difference, frequently overlooked or not comprehended, between the effect of taxing capital and the effect of taxing land value. The more land is taxed the less is its salable value, while the less it is taxed the greater is its value. But this rule does not apply to capital.

Since the salable value of land is lower in proportion as land values are more heavily taxed, therefore the taxation of land values, above all other economic reforms, tends to diminish tenancy and to give all who are hard working and thrifty the opportunity of owning land. If incomes, commodities and capital saved are less taxed, it is easier for a poor man to accumulate a competence. And if land is taxed more, then it is cheaper and can be bought at a lower price. The greater cheapness of the land fully offsets the higher tax on it and there is to be reckoned, also, the reduction or removal of other taxes. Thus there is a clear gain to any person intending to buy land for a home or other use, but no gain to the mere land speculator.

Many persons, and among them some professional economists, have never succeeded in getting a thorough comprehension of this point. Thus, the writer has heard the objection advanced that the greater cheapness of land is no advantage to the poor man who is trying to save enough from his earnings to buy a piece of land; for, it is said, the higher taxes on the land after it is acquired, offset the lower purchase price. What such objectors do not

see is that even if the lower price of land does no more than balance the higher tax on it, the reduction or removal of other taxes is all clear gain. It is easier to save in proportion as earnings and commodities are relieved of taxation. It is easier to buy land, because its selling price is lower, if the land is taxed. And although the land, after its purchase, continues to be taxed, not only can this tax be fully paid out of the annual interest on the saving in the purchase price, but also there is to be reckoned the saving in taxes on buildings and other improvements and in whatever other taxes are thus rendered unnecessary. It would seem, then, that those economists who can see no advantage to the common man in case of becoming an owner of property, from the taxation of land values rather than of other things, are lacking in the ability to make a very simple mathematical calculation. And if to tax land values rather than other values would aid the property-less person to acquire a competence, it would obviously make easier the economic rehabilitation of those to whom fortune has dealt heavy blows or of their children who must begin, at the bottom, the struggle to restore their broken family fortunes. Thus, this reform may be likened to the abolition of debt slavery and of imprisonment for debt and to the establishment of bankruptcy laws. Men could not sink so hopelessly low in the economic scale as is now possible.

The taxation of land values rather than incomes, commodities and capital is not communistic, as is a part of our present tax system. Land-value taxation does not penalize the efficient. It provides no royal road to wealth for the lazy and the thriftless. It does not attempt to reduce all to a common level. It is essentially individualistic. It leaves to the individual all that he can acquire by labor and saving. It takes for society a value which is in a peculiar sense a social product. But no system of taxing commodities, incomes, and property in general can possibly be so good for the common man, do so much to encourage ownership as against tenancy, make the opportunities of getting a start in life so hopeful, as a system of relying chiefly on the rental value of land for the provision of public revenues.

My impression has been and still is, that among the so-called spokesmen of the farmers there are almost none who understand the fundamental principles involved and are seeking a remedy which is fair and at the same time goes to the root of the difficulty. The current complaint about low land prices proves this. If those who think that a high salable value of land and high taxes on other values are the things to be desired have their way, we shall likely end with a tenant population perhaps reduced almost to the status of serfdom.

There have been periods before of low prices for agricultural staples. Such periods will occur again. Even if by some kind of favoritism of government these prices could for a time be made abnormally high, there is no

guarantee that they would stay high. But while they were high would be just the time that many farmers would buy farms at high prices, mortgaging themselves with high interest payments for years ahead. Then any fall of the prices of products would again, as so often heretofore, bring bankruptcies and foreclosures, spreading ruin among those who might, under saner taxation, have continued solvent and relatively prosperous. For a tax levied only on the rental value of land would be a lighter burden on farmers in a decade when low prices of their products made the rental value of farm land low; and always, whether prices of products were high or low, it would keep down the salable value of land and facilitate the change from tenancy to ownership, without compelling the assumption of heavy mortgage indebtedness certain to bring bankruptcies and foreclosures with every price recession. Here, then, is a reform, *not* of a *temporary* nature, serviceable only to our own generation, but one of *incalculable benefit to our children and our children's children*.

There are many persons who are, or think they are, of a liberal cast of mind and who are desirous of contributing to the welfare of common folk, who nevertheless make no substantial contribution to this end because they have not learned—though some of them may have grown gray in social studies—how to relate cause and effect, clearly and without bias, in the field of economics, or to distinguish significant influences from trifles. Of what use to hold conferences and make social surveys and carry on extended investigations of the evils of farm tenancy when the investigators never by any chance stress the effects of our inept land and taxation policy in producing a high salable value of land and so making ownership as against tenancy, as difficult for the masses of men as possible? Of what use for students of social affairs of "liberal" persuasion to plume themselves on their support of high taxes on the rich, as such, without distinction as to the sources of their incomes, when such taxes are *in place of* high taxes on land values, and so would leave the salable value of land high, land speculation unchecked, and congestion and tenancy, including farm tenancy, little relieved?

What shall we say of a so-called liberalism which does not note the effect of taxing the rental value of speculatively-held vacant land as well as of used land, in discouraging land speculation and so reducing land rent; and which does not understand how both the direct reduction, through taxing it, of the net rent privately received, and its indirect reduction through discouragement of land speculation, operate to lower the salable value of land? What shall we say of a so-called liberalism which has no least suspicion of how the resultant possible untaxing of capital may, by increasing the net rate of interest on it to those who save (unless and until increased saving again lowers the rate) further bring down the salable value of land through causing the capitalization of its reduced

rent at a *higher interest or discount rate*? What shall we say of a professed liberalism which thus utterly fails to comprehend how important is land-value taxation from the point of view of the common man and how poor a substitute is any system of taxing all kinds of property or of income, even though such taxation be made progressively higher on the rich? May we not characterize the "liberalism" which favors taxing different kinds of property or of income at the same rate as a *liberalism innocent of arithmetic*!

Those students of economics who have turned for guidance to thinkers thus confused will scarcely themselves have acquired a clear and unbiased comprehension of the land rent problem. On the contrary there may with some justice be asserted to be true of them what the historian, Buckle, remarked as being frequently true of the so-called educated, viz., that the progress of their knowledge "has been actually retarded by the activity of their education," that they are "burdened by prejudices which their reading, instead of dissipating, has rendered more inveterate," that their "erudition ministers to their ignorance" and that "the more they read, the less they know."

The Coming International Single Tax Conference at Edinburg

UNDER the direction of Judge Peter Burt of Glasgow, Chairman of the Arrangements Committee, and Ashley Mitchell, of Yorkshire, Chairman of the Programme Committee, considerable progress is being made toward perfecting the plans for the Conference of the followers of Henry George called by the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, to be held at Edinburg next summer. The formal opening of the Conference proceedings will be on Monday morning, July 29th, and a programme of discussion and entertainment will occupy most of the following week. The fine audience hall of the College of the United Free Church will be the meeting place.

An interesting feature of the gathering will be a religious service on Sunday evening, July 28th, at which representatives of various denominations will stress the religious significance of the teachings of Henry George. There will be music and choir singing.

About 200 American and Canadian followers of Henry George have enrolled in the International Union thus far and a large number of these will attend the Edinburg Conference. Among the better known subscribers are:

R. L. Atkinson, Charles G. Baldwin, H. deForest Baldwin, Mrs. Caroline Takamine Beach, James G. Blauvelt, Warren S. Blauvelt, R. R. Bowker, Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown, Edmund J. Burke, Andrew P. Canning, John S. Codman, Ralph H. Culley, Grace T. Colbron, Otto Cullman, Josiah Dudley, Anna George de Mille, Prof. J. H. Dillard, George E. Evans, Oscar H. Geiger, Mrs. Henry

George, Jr., Dr. Robert E. Graves, Bolton Hall, George M. Hartt, Charles O'C. Hennessy, Wayne D. Heydecker, Fred W. Hinrichs, Byron W. Holt, Dr. Frederick C. Howe, Henry T. Hunt, Charles H. Ingersoll, Frederic C. Leubuscher, Mrs. August Lewis, W. M. McNair, James Malcolm, Benjamin Marsh, Joseph Dana Miller, Dr. Mark Millikin, George Foster Peabody, Chester C. Platt, Dan Fellows Platt, Edward Polak, Mrs. Alice Thacher Post, Lawson Purdy, Laurie J. Quinby, George L. Record, Charles T. Root, George L. Rusby, Thomas P. Ryan, Bertram Saunders, Albert Schalkenbach, John H. Scully, John B. Sharpe, Frank Stephens, Jennie Rogers, Alan C. Thompson, William B. Vernam, Harry Weinberger, Percy R. Williams, Harry H. Willock and Efram Zimbalist.

Death of Warren Worth Bailey

WARREN WORTH BAILEY, veteran Single Taxer, friend of Henry George and for many years editor of the *Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat*, died Nov. 9, aged 73.

Mr. Bailey was one of the leading democrats of Pennsylvania and was elected to the House of Representatives in 1912 and re-elected in 1914. He was defeated for the same office in 1916, 1924 and 1926. Before that he was editor and proprietor of the *Vincennes (Indiana) News* and later editorial writer on the *Chicago News* and the *Chicago Evening Mail*. In 1893 he went to Johnstown and acquired the *Johnstown Democrat* which he and his brother Homer Bailey conducted for many years with signal ability. Homer Bailey, author of "How to Get Rich Without Working" and other Single Tax tracts and pamphlets, died several years ago.

Warren Worth Bailey was one of the few surviving members of the group of the early days of the Henry George movement. In a letter to the Editor of *LAND AND FREEDOM* published in Jan.-Feb. issue of this year, Mr. Bailey wrote: "I was saddened by the news of James H. Barry's death. One by one the old guard is passing. * * * It is one of my glad possessions that it was permitted me to know so many of them—Henry George himself, Dr. McGlynn, Judge Maguire, Thomas G. Shearman, William Lloyd Garrison, John J. White, William T. Croasdale and all that gallant company."

Of that "gallant company" he himself was an honored member. His stalwart advocacy of Henry George's principles was in evidence to the last when he hailed with enthusiasm the organization of the Henry George Foundation and became a member of the Advisory Commission.

Mr. Bailey was born in Hendricks County, Indiana. He is survived by his widow and two children.

TO Socialists and indeed to most of the political economists competition has broken down. It has broken down because it is not free and not a single teacher outside the Henry George group asks why it is not free.

Militant Single Taxer

(From the *New York Tribune*)

AS an editor and as a member of Congress, Warren Worth Bailey was a militant Single Taxer. When he was twenty-three years old he became the editor of a daily newspaper published at Vincennes, Ind., to espouse the cause of the Single Tax. He was a delegate to the first National Single Tax Conference, held in New York in 1890. The Single Taxers in the middle West organized the Chicago Single Tax Club and Mr. Bailey was elected president. When he moved to Johnstown, Pa., he retained his interest in the subject by organizing the Cambria County Single Tax Club.

Mr. Bailey was an aggressive Democrat. He was elected to Congress in 1912 and was re-elected in 1914. In 1924 he contested the election of his Republican opponent, Anderson H. Walters, publisher of *The Johnstown Tribune*, but the contest was thrown out after months of investigation.

In Congress Mr. Bailey, who was a close friend of William Jennings Bryan, expressed himself as a foe of the Anti-Saloon League and the Ku-Klux-Klan. Before the United States entered the World War Mr. Bailey hotly disputed the arguments of his opponents that America should go in for a programme of intensive preparedness. "The poison of preparedness has brought a sort of madness upon many minds," he declared in an address at Clark University.

In February, 1917, when the question whether America should enter the war was causing bitter debate in Congress a speech delivered by Mr. Bailey was ordered expunged by a vote of the House. In the speech Mr. Bailey said: "I thank God for William Jennings Bryan in this hour of grave peril to republican institutions. I thank God for those men and women who refuse to bow at the feet of Mars, at the call of the warmongers and the traffickers in munitions." The speech contained references to Representative A. P. Gardner, who said he had been insulted.

Bailey of Johnstown

(From the *Brooklyn Eagle*)

BACK in 1892, when Grover Cleveland was running for President the last time, W. W. Bailey was a co-worker with Eugene Field on the *Chicago Daily News*, owned by Victor F. Lawson and Melville E. Stone. But not for long. Bailey yearned for a newspaper somewhere that he could make the exponent of his strongly-held personal views on public questions. Before 1893 was ended he was proprietor of the *Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat*, which he owned till his death at the age of 73, on Friday. That he made "Bailey of Johnstown" pretty well known in the State and Nation, no one will dispute.

Mr. Bailey was a Single Taxer, and had never swerved from the Henry George doctrine of "Progress and

Poverty." He hated and was hated by the Ku-Klux Klan. He was in his late years an unflinching foe of Prohibition. Yet he had been one of the warmest friends of William Jennings Bryan, and his Congressional eulogy on Bryan is reprinted in some of his newspaper obituaries. Twice "Bailey of Johnstown" was elected to Congress in a Republican district; in 1912 and 1914. He ran in vain in 1916. Then in 1924 he had his famous election contest with Alderson H. Walters, publisher of the *Johnstown Tribune*, in which Bailey was beaten, after months of investigation by the House Committee. Once more he ran in 1926, but was unsuccessful. Always he was a powerful influence in the control of the Democratic party of Pennsylvania.

Bailey may be regarded as about the last type of the "editor and proprietor" who makes views that most people consider eccentric or extremist the keynote of his editorials. Perhaps not the last, for Oswald Garrison Villard, champion of the rights of colored men, still edits the *Nation*; and it is as unshrinking as Horace Greeley ever was for abolition and total abstinence in the older days of the *New York Tribune*. Those who disagree with such a man have to admire his courage and his stamina; also his measure of unselfishness, for as a business policy his method is never helpful and often harmful to his interests. "Bailey of Johnstown" might perhaps have been a millionaire newspaper owner but for this striking consideration.

A Landowner Who Relies on the Baby Crop

IN one of the Reporter's Nosegays that on Sundays adorn this page there was related the other day an observation oddly suggestive of a controversy that once loomed large in our public affairs and still has its intensive students.

A wealthy Philadelphian, owner of 1300 acres of land in Bryn Mawr and Radnor, was asked what he raised on the property. His reply was:

"Nothing—just some grass. But the biggest crop of all will give me my harvest on that land. I am counting on the baby crop of Philadelphia to cause the city to expand and use the ground for homes. Babies are Philadelphia's most important product, and often overlooked in suburban farming."

One wonders whether the speaker was aware that in his whimsical explanation he was expressing one of the fundamental principles underlying a formidable economic theory. That reference to the "baby crop" as the force producing the "unearned increment" that accrues to the landholder might almost have been lifted from Henry George's "Progress and Poverty."

Was it sly or unconscious humor that led the eminent Main Line proprietor to utter this familiar maxim of the advocates of the Single Tax?

—*Philadelphia Record*

Tribute to John Dewey

A BUST of Prof. John Dewey was presented Nov. 9 to the Teachers College of Columbia University. Among the subscribers to this tribute were Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Prof. E. R. A. Seligman, Rabbi Stephen Wise, and David Starr Jordan. The funds included also contributions of a penny each from thousands of school children.

In his presentation speech, Prof. William H. Kilpatrick, of the Teachers College said:

"Prof. Dewey must be included among the great thinkers of all time. He has, in the minds of many, changed almost our whole conception of what philosophy is, delivering us from the old puzzles that have formed the stock in trade of the traditional philosophy.

"His philosophy has common sense acceptability and a social bearing which distinguishes it in degree from all other philosophers. Professor Dewey has influenced American education more profoundly than any other person throughout its whole history. No pupil in an American school, but what lives a different school life because of his teachings."

Fraud and Robbery

AS a result of too much business in government the American people were hoodwinked into levying tariff taxes upon themselves and to turn the proceeds over to certain manufacturers as a trust fund to be used in paying high wages to their employees. The manufacturers accepted but have appropriated the money for their own use. To such an extent has this legalized embezzlement been carried on that in every city and town containing a protected factory there is a charity organization or a community chest to alleviate poverty among the defrauded workers. In New Bedford, Massachusetts, some protected manufacturers went so far as to order a ten per cent, reduction of wages and only after a strike of many weeks finally consented to make the reduction only five per cent. Workingmen who have swallowed protectionist bunk should long ago have learned something from such experiences. "Experience", said Ben Franklin, "keeps a dear school but fools will learn in no other." He might have added "and protectionists won't even learn in that."

NATIONS aren't likely to beat their swords into plowshares while beating their rivals into oil fields.

—*Altoona Tribune*.

Can We Promote Prosperity?

ADDRESS OF CHARLES H. CILISKE, HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 12

I THINK we are all agreed that the Single Tax will promote prosperity. What there is disagreement about is the question whether emphasizing the fact that the Single Tax will bring prosperity is the best way to increase the membership of the Henry George Clubs?

So I wish to give a brief outline of the idea back of the Henry George Prosperity Club to show its value for propaganda purposes.

New as the idea seems to be, it is still quite old. It started with me some years ago, when pondering the problem presented by the question:

"Why, in spite of our having the best proposition ever presented to a people for their consideration and approval, does our movement grow so slowly?"

And pondering, I saw what I believe to be the stumbling block to the more rapid spread of our idea among the voters, so that they could conscientiously join our movement and demand the enactment of our cardinal principle into law.

I do not mean to say that we have made no progress or no converts. We have, but nothing like what we ought to make and will have to make, if we are ever to have sufficient public sentiment behind our movement to compel the enactment of our central principle into law.

There have been wonderful books and pamphlets printed for our propaganda; and famous orators have made wonderful speeches to audiences that would be thrilled to great enthusiasm by their logic.

But so far as the masses of voters are concerned, the ratio between economic ignorance and economic wisdom is as great as ever.

The average man knows absolutely nothing of Henry George; nothing about the Single Tax; nothing about economic rent; nothing about the effect of taxes on business or labor or prosperity. Nothing so far has been written on the taxation of land values, since "Progress and Poverty" that appeals to the average man, so that it can be said that it is bringing him into the movement in greater numbers than the customary one at a time. The army with banners bringing in the elusive prisoner, "Public Sentiment" predicted for our movement fifty years ago by Henry George is still in the future.

I have often compared the present civilization to an automobile that won't run. Everything is there,—gas, water, oil, starter and generator O. K. And yet, the darn thing won't go. The owner tried to start it until his battery is almost worn out, and then he starts to crank. And he cranks and cranks and still it won't go. And out of the crowd that has gathered to watch the performance steps a man who asks the owner of the car what might be the trouble. The owner admits he doesn't know and is trying to find out. So the stranger goes to the car and

after making a few eliminative tests, he sees that the trouble is in the distributor. That is, the grounding of a little piece of wire produced a short circuit, so that the current needed could not reach the spark plugs. He adjusted that and seeing that the gears were in neutral, pressed down the starter and the motor started without further trouble.

So with Henry George when he came upon the scene. He found the world puttering with a car called Civilization, and like the mechanical car just described, the darn thing wouldn't go either. Its going was periodically interrupted by hard times, over production and business depressions; and the remedies applied were soup kitchens, free beds and charity balls.

These periods of depression would last a long time and bring idleness and misery to labor and bankruptcy to business. Being specially gifted with economic, analytical and diagnostical ability, Henry George set himself the task of discovering what the trouble was and how it might be cured. For, seeing the vice and misery and poverty and wretchedness that spring from the unequal distribution of wealth and power would not let him rest.

And so he examined and analyzed and diagnosed and weighed and wrote. And his writings resulted in the production of a wonderful book. Such a book on political economy as the world never saw before or since. This book, generally speaking, divides itself into three parts: Ailment, remedy and health of civilization.

The ailment was described by the term "Progress and Poverty." The remedy was called: "Taxing Land Values Exclusively." This has since become known as the Single Tax. The cured patient was described as one who was enjoying "Permanent Prosperity" and the most splendid environment imaginable, enabling it to develop a culture of the very highest order, with justice and liberty reigning supreme.

Like every other book ever written, this book had to have a name. The choice lay between a title descriptive of either the ailment, the remedy, or the cure, health of civilization, and it fell to the lot of the ailment.—"Progress and Poverty" was chosen as a title for the book. Single Tax was adopted as a name for the remedy and the movement. The cure or health alone was left unnamed. No concrete title such as "Progress and Poverty" or "Single Tax" or "Protection" or "Free Trade," had ever been given to the economic condition that we firmly believe will obtain in civilization after the Single Tax is applied.

So about four years ago, pondering the question first propounded: "Why, in spite of our having the best proposition ever put before a people for their consideration, does our movement grow so slowly?" I came to the conclusion that we were neglecting the most important phase of our movement for propaganda purposes. The epochal point in our movement is just when the remedy is ap-

plied. After the remedy is applied will come such a time of real Prosperity as the world has never seen.

So I started to talk Permanent Prosperity. Little by little I developed the story as now told in the pamphlet of that name. I told it over and over until I got so I could hold a person's attention while I was telling it. But it was not the fact that I was holding the attention of the listener that convinced me I was on the right track. But the expression of approval I received from men who were total strangers to the Henry George philosophy. So from telling the story of Permanent Prosperity to the people I came in contact with, I started to write it. After finishing it, I polished and boiled it down to the last syllable. A few friends read it, and with their approval, it went to the printer.

After getting it from the printer, I began to sell it, not give it away. I received so many expressions of approval from men who had never read a line of Henry George that I felt sure that the time was ripe to take the next step and organize a club along the line suggested in Permanent Prosperity. This was done, and the first Henry George Prosperity Club held its first meeting with a good attendance and lots of enthusiasm among those present.

A president, vice-president and secretary-treasurer were elected. After informal discussion on local matters and the selection of a delegate, the meeting was adjourned to the call of the chair.

All this is the result of these young men reading Permanent Prosperity and hearing me explain the Henry George idea along that line.

So it seems to me that if I can accomplish this much by myself, how much more could be accomplished by our united effort? A club in every ward and a captain in every precinct.

The Henry George Prosperity Club realizes, of course, that it has nothing to crow about as yet; it may fall down absolutely flat. It knows that everything lies in the future. Mistakes may be made, as in other human institutions. These will be rectified as soon as possible. But our whole aim and object will be to get Public Sentiment behind us.

We have eighteen or twenty young men now as members in the club and more ready to join as soon as we become more thoroughly organized.

These young men have signified a willingness to put on the harness and get down to hard work.

Now wouldn't it be a wonderful thing if we were to organize a number of Henry George Prosperity Clubs in this city and start a Henry George faction and elect a dozen or two Henry George men to the City Council? Wouldn't it be just wonderful to start something like that, and wouldn't that be an answering echo to the appeal sounded by Henry George fifty years ago when he wrote: "He who will hear, to him the Clarions of the battle call, and call, and call, and call, till the heart swells that hears them. Strong soul and high endeavor, the world needs you now."

Employment and Poverty

BY GRACE ISABEL COLBRON

OWING TO MISS COLBRON'S ABSENCE THE PAPER WAS
READ AT THE HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, SEPT. 11

THE problem of increasing unemployment, called by some reformers the "shame of our modern civilization," (and the lion in the path of the politician who would paint the blessings of this best of all worlds), is, for the moment, a matter of such pressing import that it blinds the eyes to the greater shame that lies behind it, the shame that conditions it. The willing worker who cannot find work, and, as a consequence, cannot provide the barest necessities of life for himself or his dear ones is indeed a pitiable, nay even a tragic figure in these days of high-pressure production of wealth. The vague sentiment of the many who are anxious "to do something for somebody" without knowing what, centers around this figure. As do the fears of those who see the danger his increasing numbers mean to any highly civilized community.

But what neither the soft-hearted "philanthropist," nor the opportunist politician, nor, sometimes, even the eager reformer seeking causes, see is the fact that behind this growing unemployment and attendant poverty lie generations, centuries even, of poverty attendant on *employment*, poverty that has always, as soon as any vestige of "modern civilization" came into being, been the lot of the toiler even while he toiled. This is the very heart and core of the shame of civilization; this fact that work, manual labor employed in basic production, wresting from the earth the necessities of life for mankind, forming them into shape for mankind's use, has seldom put the most willing worker out of reach of poverty—that poverty Henry George calls "the open-mouthed relentless hell yawning beneath civilized society."

The shame of our modern civilization is that work, i. e. the basic toil of production, is in very fact synonymous with poverty. Even in these days of Ford cars for the Masses and apparent high wages, the hurried reporter frequently uses the phrase "a poorly dressed man, evidently a working-man." And the "poor but honest working girl in her simple print gown," is still a stock figure of melodrama *because* so perfectly comprehensible to any audience. The gown is silk now, but cheap silk that does not last,—And the change of material is but one opportunity the more for the sob-sister paragraphist or the film scenarist to awaken sympathy with the "pathetic luxuries of the poor."

The danger of passing industrial crises that mean unemployment to many is a very real danger because the great mass of toilers, manual or white-collar class, have never been able to set aside enough money to tide them over such times of depression. The poverty attendant on unemployment, the under-consumption that causes stoppage of the wheels of industry, conditioning more un-

employment in an endless vicious circle—all this is what it is because *employment*, steady, exhausting, grinding toil in basic producing industry, has never meant wealth, has scarcely meant even barest comfort for the great mass of workers, has never put but the most flimsy rail-guard between them and this open-mouthed relentless hell of bitterest want. This hell yawns for every manual laborer no matter what the momentary figure of his pay-envelope; for every office worker; it yawns for the man with a small business of his own; it yawns for the intellectual worker, the men and women of the arts and the professions, if they be honest with themselves and refuse to become sycophants of Privilege. It is there waiting, ready to engulf the most faithful worker, the worker lucky enough to secure a "steady job;" it reaches with flaming claws to drag him down if even the barest touch of human ill comes to him, sickness, accident, the desire to help the less fortunate—all this means that the worker slides down toward that open-mouthed hell of Poverty waiting ever for him—the *worker*, comrades, not the idler nor the parasite,—not the unlucky unemployed alone, but the worker who is willing to work and has work—and does work. What if, for the moment, in some parts of our country at least, wages seem to have risen sufficiently to allow of provision for such emergencies. Follow the statistics of the cost of living and you will find that for the average worker the result is the same. He is still skating on the thin edge of this gulf of Poverty, balancing precariously, always in danger of falling in.

The records of any of the charitable organizations, government statistics of wages and of living costs, the columns of our daily papers, tell us an hundred times how true it is that poverty goes hand in hand with employment, that even a working year of fifty-two weeks of forty-eight hours each does not put many a man and many a woman beyond the need of want.

Here, it seems to me, lies our great mission. We need not in any way appear to minimize the problem of unemployment, nor the danger of it to the world of today. Nor need we hold back with the reiteration of our belief that artificial restriction of natural opportunity is the chief cause of unemployment and its attendant ills. But do not let us give too much time, too many words to this. All the political parties pleading for votes today are promising "employment on public work"—sick insurance, and the like. England with her "dole" that keeps her poor and leads nowhere, is a fine case in point. It is for us, the followers of Henry George, to point out how little good all this can do; to point out that even if employment, for the moment or for longer, could be found for every willing worker, there would still be grinding poverty, under-consumption, economic injustice, in the midst of this our modern mechanical civilization.

It is for us to point out that the shame of the modern world lies in the fact that work does not mean wealth—for the *worker*—lies in the fact that the toiler goes hungry

even when he has work, while privileged idleness feasts. It is for us to point out that there never will be any cure for *unemployment* until we make *employment* profitable; until the worker receives the full return for his work, now taken from him by parasitic monopoly of natural opportunity and parasitic taxation in its train. It is for us to point out that under the present economic system employment for every willing worker—if some paternal government could provide it over night, with all sorts of insurance benefits, "cheap-homes-for-workers" developments and so forth and so on—would only mean extra profits for the land-owner, added taxation to make up the difference, higher prices all along the line—and the worker little better off in the end. It is for us to point out the fundamental wrong condition that makes unemployment so light a matter for some, so terrible a danger for others. "He who will not work shall not eat." But he who does work is never sure that he will be able to eat tomorrow; whereas there are many who do not work and employ physicians to cure them from the effects of over-eating.

Our mission is to make a suffering world understand that the loss of the job is but the symptom of a worse disease, a symptom of the canker at the heart of our civilization that robs the job of its profit, robs the worker of the return for his labor.

If we deal with the question of unemployment in this sense our contribution to world thought is of value. If we merely fall in with the present day political patter and offer "cures for unemployment," or even causes for it, we are wasting our time. I repeat, the shame of modern civilization is not the temporary appalling unemployment and the poverty resulting from it, terrible as this is; the shame is the fact that *employment* means poverty only one degree less worse than that resulting from unemployment. And because of this, even the most temporary unemployment spells disaster. Let work which produces wealth mean wealth to the worker. Then a spell of temporary unemployment would mean only welcome leisure.

Our Common Cause

JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS

MR. MONROE said in part: We of the Registration Committee have enjoyed the opportunity that our work has given us to meet each of you and to become more intimately acquainted with the work that each of you is doing in the various parts of this country. It has inspired us to meet the leaders of this great social movement who have gathered here to tell of their work, to express their hopes of the future, and to give encouragement and help to their fellow workers.

One observation that we have made is of the great ability of all the men and women here. While each one approaches the doctrine of Henry George from his own point of view,

each one works for it from the heart. And some men emphasize certain phases of the Single Tax. Henry George's proposition not only says we must take the full value of the land but that we must publicly own those natural opportunities which are in their nature monopolies. So our humorist and idealist, Carl D. Thompson, bends his invaluable efforts to the power and public utility question. Charles O'Connor Hennessy uses his great diplomatic and political capacities to further the cause of Henry George as an international movement. Otto Cullman and Emil Jorgenson concentrate their efforts on one of the most insidious opponents of the Henry George doctrine.

Regardless of *why* we want Single Tax, we all work for it heart, soul, and body. Sometimes when I think of all the good times I am having working with Single Taxers, those of my own age, and those older, I find it hard to call it really *work*. But whether we call it work or play, however, it is certain that we follow after our own thinking and our own desires. We do the work that we enjoy the most and which we believe *we* can do most effectively for the common cause.

There are now arising a new group of Single Taxers in a field of work I have not yet mentioned. That field is the field of education. During this conference there have been two speeches by professors who represent the new intelligent, enlightened, progressive educator, economist and philosopher of the American university: Harry Gunnison Brown and Frederick W. Roman. In regard to Prof. Roman's speech at the banquet last night I am very happy to say that the views he expressed there are current among many of the progressive students and professors at the University of Chicago.

I took out of the University library a few weeks ago, the old gilt edge, beautifully printed Doubleday, Page edition of Henry George's complete works. In the library cards were written the names of some of the finest students of the school as well as the name of P. L. Douglas, professor of economics at the University. I had heard from a friend that Prof. Douglas had devoted a week or more in his economics course to the study of Henry George and the Single Tax. This friend incidentally is a fine young fellow of about my age, a Chinese boy who was entirely familiar with and in sympathy with Henry George and the Single Tax from his knowledge of the work of Sun Yet Sen.

My Chinese friend and I became acquainted in a course in philosophy "Currents of Thought in the Nineteenth Century." In this course we studied the Idealists—a name given to that group of philosophers who are so taken up with the intellectual possibilities of the human race that they forget the physical necessities of the human body. They forget that before the intellectual and cultural desires of the human being can be satisfied that his physical desires must first be satisfied. There are still a great many philosophy professors who do not realize

this, but it is getting now so that the students—that is the ones who have not taken too much of the philosophy course hook, line, and sinker—are demanding the presentation of a philosophy that takes into account the physical desires of the human race as well as the intellectual and cultural. They are demanding a philosophy that gives to them confidence in the best that is in them. They are demanding a philosophy that gives them a self respect and that rids them of imaginary inferiority complexes. In short, they are demanding Henry George. The enlightened professor will come to know that there is such a demand and that this demand is to assume tremendous proportions at almost any moment. They had better have their courses in Henry George laid out and ready for presentation. Dr. Roman was right last night when he said: "There are two powerful streams of thought marching on together to a common point—the educational thought of John Dewey and the economic thought of Henry George."

The Congress has led us to see that the Henry George educational work is going forward through publications, distribution of literature, and practical enclavial demonstrations. It has introduced us to men who are rising in the leadership of education, religion, and politics. It has demonstrated that the Henry George Foundation is stimulating and encouraging in cooperating with all activities working for the common cause. And greatest of all, the Congress has added confidence to our belief that in our own life time we shall see the acceptance of the Henry George doctrines as a basis of a higher and nobler civilization.

Natural Law

ADDRESS OF HENRY H. HARDINGE, HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, SEPT. 11.

THE American people are doing their level best to harmonize two things, that in the nature of things are wholly irreconcilable. A perfectly modern system of production and an ancient system of distribution.

The one is typical of the present and the future, the other belongs to the past. The one is characteristic of the democratic state, the other is the direct descendant of monarchy and aristocracy. The one is honest and square and the other is out of square, and the two things cannot be harmonized; they are irreconcilably hostile. The one is cast in the mold of equal rights, the other in the mold of privilege, and we must abandon one or the other. We cannot keep both.

The one is rapidly growing, evolving, changing; it is scientific, productive, modern, wonderful and gigantic, and its marvelous productiveness is the only thing that keeps the whole structure from collapsing right now.

Under the hood of the modern automobile, can be found one of the most remarkable contrivances that the resilient

wit of man has ever developed to cater to both pleasure and profit. It is the internal combustion engine. In this device is involved every law of kinetics, every law of electro-chemical metallurgy, geologic metallurgy and metal working.

Every law of electricity is involved in the self starter and battery, every law of physics is in it, every principle, almost every force, and they are all the product of nature.

There is a law of inertia that the self starter overcomes. There is the law of momentum in the fly wheel. There is the law of induction, compression, explosion, and exhaustion in the four cycle principle, and every law, every force, and every bit of material in that wonderful device are contributed by nature, not one single, solitary thing under the hood is furnished by legislation or legislators.

What is true of the hydro-carbon engine, is true of all engines, and devices for the rapid production of wealth.

The whole arena of modern production is fashioned and based upon the same foundation; the laws, materials and forces of nature, and upon nothing else.

Indeed! modern science in its endless ramifications is based exactly upon the same thing, and a real scientist is distinguished by the fact that he bases his conclusions, his discoveries, and his whole life work upon exactly the same enduring foundation.

Now, does it stand to reason that fecund and generous nature, that has given us every law, every force, and every bit of raw material, out of which we fashion the modern industrial state, has suddenly become bankrupt on the subject of distribution? Not only is it not reasonable. IT IS NOT TRUE.

Our socialists and communist friends assume nature's bankruptcy in this matter; in fact you can run the whole gamut from Tory to Communist and you will not find a *champion of liberty in the lot*. The Tory, the paternalist, the protectionist, the trade unionist, the syndicalist, the socialist and the communist are drawn from the same stock. They have a common ancestor, and that ancestor is force, brute force.

It finds expression in the dictatorship of the proletariat, "The Class Struggle," "Collective Bargaining," and the Tory demands for armies, navies and policemen. Not one of the lot has any broad gauged understanding of, or confidence in the natural laws of freedom. It is the last thing, not the first thing, that your one hundred per cent. American thinks of, or believes in as a remedy for the multitudinous evils that beset our industrial society, and yet freedom is the only possible solution.

Every fungus-brained Tory in the world is against it. Shaw, the Fabian, laughs at it. Mussolini, the socialist, despises and flouts it. Every rattle-brained radical on earth today, has neither conception of it nor faith in it, because he lacks knowledge of it, and yet it is the only way.

Until Wilbur and Orville Wright mastered the principles of flying, they did not fly, because they could not.

That is why Langley's plane fell in the river. In flying he was not a scientist, he had not mastered the first principles. The Wright brothers had. That is why they flew successfully; they were real scientists and they proved it.

It is the same in political economy. Henry George was a real scientist. He based his findings on the natural law of rent—The Ricardian Law—that rent is the difference between the least and the most valuable land in use with the same amount of labor, and he demonstrated beyond contest that rent being as it is the automatic reflector of social benefits, it will also be the automatic absorber of social benefits, and if left in private hands as now, the few will get the benefits that ought to accrue to the many, and that under the Single Tax, "rent" would be the automatic distributor of social benefits, as it is now the absorber.

George proved that the benefits of invention, discovery and general social advance, increase the value of land and tend to decrease the value of everything else. He proved that the logical result of invention should be to cheapen goods, instead of raising rent.

He proved that rent is an exaction in private hands, not a contribution, and that the reverse should be the case, and he showed conclusively that the major values and organization are today reflected in the value of land, as distinguished from all other values, and that the only rational way to socialize the modern mechanism of production is to socialize the thing in which all modern methods are reflected, that is the high capitalized value of land.

Every imaginable expedient, every artifice, every possible device that selfish ingenuity can marshal will be resorted to by the beneficiaries of privilege to avoid substantial change in our system of distribution which automatically levies private taxes in colossal amounts upon the industrialists of this country. A system that charges about half of everything produced for the mere privilege of producing anything cannot be successfully defended.

A system where unemployment is chronic just as it is under aristocracies as in England, and where producing useful things and exchanging them is regarded as a *privilege to be paid for* and not as a right to be taken and held against all owners as it is in new countries that have not yet passed into the possession of speculators and monopolists. Civil government is now and always has been the agent of privilege and the destroyer of equal rights and it always will be as long as the present system of taxation obtains that levies its burdens upon labor-made values instead of law-made values. Heroic action must be preceded by heroic thinking; the outstanding characteristic of American life today is *muddy thinking* on all matters economic and has been from the beginning.

Our chairs of Political Economy in the great universities are for the most part filled with professional obscurantists like Seligman and Ely, and their understudies are little better than intellectual tightrope walkers, who are much more expert at *balancing* than they are in expounding the

laws that govern the distribution of wealth in the modern state. Think of a system so devastating mentally and morally, that can compel and that does compel thousands of alleged teachers of the youth and maidens of this country, whose real office is to tell our boys and girls the truth about political economy who dare not do it, and who in order to make a living, and very often a mean living at that, are compelled to "crook the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift may follow fawning," Can anything be more contemptible? This, too, in the face of demonstrable fact that the laws of distribution are as natural, as rhythmic, as harmonious, as beautiful and as wonderful as the blending colors of a sunset.

They are just as harmonious as the marvellous laws that govern production and infinitely more useful because we live in a world overstocked with goods on the one hand and charity-mongers on the other, and both out of balance, the one in economics and the other in mental equipment.

Any system that will bring the purchasing power of the worker up to par with the producing power will settle this question and nothing else can. Toryism will not do it; it is too stupid. Charity will not; it is too ignorant. Trade Unionism will not; it is too circumscribed and too self-centered.

Socialism and communism will not, not so much from lack of will but from sheer lack of ability; favoritism and colossal overhead charges alone prevent it to say nothing of their ignorance of economic principles and inability to distinguish between equality of opportunity and equality of income, which are antipodal principles.

Only one practical suggestion has ever been made looking to an intelligent and scientific solution of this problem and that is the one made by Henry George in 1879.

Almost half a century ago Henry George wrote the one outstanding classic that has been written upon the subject of political economy. He did for this science what Copernicus did for astronomy, and what Darwin did for biology. Three great outstanding heroic contributions to the intellectual and the material advance of the human race.

That book today rests upon the granite pedestal of truth, face up, open for the thinking world to scan. There it is, matchless in logic, beautiful in diction, perfect in illustration, unchallenged and unchallengeable, unanswered and unanswerable, an everlasting monument to the intellectual and moral integrity of the man who wrote it, and there it will remain forever.

IN our opinion, to Hon. Anthony J. Griffin, member of the House of Representatives from New York City, goes the credit of having made in April last the best speech delivered in the House against the McNary-Haugen Bill. Mr. Griffin is one of the outstanding free traders in Congress and a friend of former register Edward Polak.

Forerunners of Henry George

ADDRESS OF TOASTMASTER A. P. CANNING,
BANQUET HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11

I WONDER if the honor conferred on me as timekeeper of this distinguished gathering is due to the fact that I have had some training for the job.

When floods of after dinner oratory are turned loose on an unprotected audience, it is well to have on hand one who has spent his most useful years in the plumbing business. Plumbers not only know how to handle hot solder and stop leaks, but also how to charge up the time consumed in so doing. Objection was always made because we charged not only for the time at work, but for the time consumed going to and from the job. Tonight I warn speakers (especially our home talent) that all time consumed will be charged against them, from the moment they are called, until they sit down again. All attempts to cast ridicule on the chair with alleged jokes at the expense of Scotland and the Scots, will be charged at double time rates.

I do not like to take advantage of my temporary power to scold any member of the audience, except to protest the action of the ungracious pastor of the Vine Street Congregational Church of Cincinnati, who without provocation singled me out last night as one who would probably oppose his aristocratic scheme of old age pensions, as a remedy for the ills of democracy. Last night was not the first time Dr. Bigelow took advantage of his office to make jests at the expense of useful citizens. I recall that once, in his attempts to keep his audience from going to sleep, he began a lecture—he called it a sermon—on the "Servant in the House," after this fashion: "The aspiring and ambitious clergyman had a brother who was no asset to him in his efforts to climb. This brother was a ne'er-do-well, a drunkard. Worse than that, he was an agnostic, worse than that, he was a plumber." Evidently poison ivy is the only vine which grows well around the Vine Street Congregational Church of Cincinnati.

A brother Scot from Aberdeen on your committee, I suspect, is responsible for the topic assigned to me. He and I are agreed that the only "forerunners of Henry George," worth talking about—Moses excepted—are those who were lucky enough to be born in that part of Great Britain which lies north of the Tweed. Such men as Ogilvie, Carlyle and Burns. And the last shall be first.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ROBERT BURNS

When I first read Henry George, it was the identification of his philosophy with that of Burns which impressed me most. If we had time it would be interesting to trace the poetical prose of George so much of the same gospel that was preached in prose and verse in the 18th Century by Burns.

In "Progress and Poverty," we read, "Though contempt of worldly advantages is necessary to supreme felicity, yet the keenest pain possible is inflicted by extreme poverty." Also "From whence springs this lust for gain, to gratify which men tread everything pure and noble under their feet; to which they sacrifice all the higher possibilities of life; which converts civility into a hollow pretense, patriotism into a sham, and religion into hypocrisy; which makes so much of civilized existence an Ishmaelitic warfare, of which the weapons are cunning and fraud?"

"Does it not spring from the existence of want? Carlyle somewhere says that poverty is the hell of which the modern Englishman is most afraid. And he is right. Poverty is the open-mouthed relentless hell which yawns beneath civilized society. And it is hell enough."

Neither George nor Burns spent much time in describing the imaginary situations, which so often engage the attention and talents of fiction writers or dilettantes in literature. Both have written largely from their own experience or from what they beheld with clear understanding and deepest sympathy, in the lives of their contemporaries.

That the sentiment which enriches the work of Burns constantly animated his own bosom in the intercourse of life, is found in many of his private letters, as for instance, in his letter to Peter Hill, we read:

A REMARKABLE LETTER

Ellisland, 17th Jan., 1791.

"Take these two guineas and place them over against that damned account of yours! which has gagged my mouth these five or six months! I can as little write good things as apologies to the man I owe money to. O the supreme curse of making three guineas do the business of five! Not all the labours of Hercules; not all the Hebrews' three centuries of Egyptian bondage, were such an insuperable business, such an infernal task!! Poverty! thou half sister of death, thou cousin-german of hell! where shall I find force of execration equal to the amplitude of thy demerits? Oppressed by thee, the venerable ancient, grown hoary in the practice of every virtue, laden with years and wretchedness, implores a little—a little aid to support his existence, from the stony-hearted son of Mammon, whose sun of prosperity never knew a cloud; and is by him denied and insulted. Oppressed by thee, the man of sentiment, whose heart glows with independence, and melts with sensibility, inly pines under the neglect, or writhes in bitterness of soul, under the contumely of arrogant, unfeeling wealth. Oppressed by thee, the son of genius, whose ill-starred ambition plants him at the tables of the fashionable and polite, must see in suffering silence, his remarks neglected, and his person despised; while shallow greatness, in his idiot attempts at wit, shall meet with countenance and applause. Nor is it only the family of worth [that have reason to complain of thee; the children of folly and vice, though in

common with thee the offspring of evil, smart equally under the rod. Owing to thee, the man of unfortunate disposition and neglected education, is condemned as a fool for his dissipation, despised and shunned as a needy wretch, when his follies as usual bring him to want; and when his unprincipled necessities drive him to dishonest practices, he is abhorred as a miscreant, and perishes by the justices of his country. But far otherwise is the lot of the man of family and fortune. His early follies and extravagance are spirit and fire; his consequent wants are the embarrassments of an honest fellow; and when to remedy the matter, he has gained a legal commission to plunder distant provinces, or massacre peaceful nations, he returns, perhaps, laden with the spoils of rapine and murder; lives wicked and respected, and dies a scoundrel and a lord."

When in the coming day of democratic civilization for which so many are hoping and so few are working, we shall better understand the ploughman poet, who when the night was darkest, had a vision and remained true to it, of that better day coming when those who do the worlds work shall win the worlds prizes. Or, as he expressed it—"When sense and worth, o'er a' the earth, shall bear the gree, and a' that."

BURN'S CRITERION OF GOODNESS

Note again how this 18th Century ploughman expressed your ideal when he wrote:

"Whatever mitigates the woes or increases the happiness of others, this is my criterion of goodness, and whatever injures society at large, or any individual in it, this is my measure of iniquity."

I am not forgetting that it is Henry George's birthday, not that of Robert Burns, which calls us together. But surely in speaking to the text of "Forerunners of Henry George," you will pardon this reference to an 18th Century Scot, who through his love of Justice and Humanity and by his exposure of aristocratic pretense, privilege and priestcraft, became the champion and patron saint of democracy. A forerunner who ploughed deep the soil into which the seed sown by Henry George should grow, as you well know it has grown over there, and will continue to grow until the kingdom preached by the young man from Jerusalem shall abolish the hell of poverty and war, which again threaten our civilization. Why should we doubt the coming of that kingdom of Peace and Plenty? If Burns in the darkest days of the 18th Century could see it afar off, surely we can, with hope, work and

"pray that come it may,

As come it will for a' that,
When man to man the world o'er,
Shall brithers be for a' that."

CARLYLE, TOO, SAW THE LAND QUESTION

Time and your patience will not permit us to say much about that other forerunner of George, the man of Eccle-

fechan, except to refer you to his chapter on *Aristocracy* in "*Past and Present*." While Carlyle was distrustful of democracy, my friend White here insists he saw the land question as clearly as Henry George. Calling attention to the fact that the Feudal Aristocracy, in return for the reaping of England's land and land values, had to do all the "Soldiering, Policing, Judging and Lawmaking, even the Church-Extension; whatsoever in the way of Governing, of Guiding and Protecting could be done. It was a Land Aristocracy; it managed the Governing of this English People, and had the reaping of the Soil of England in return. It is, in many senses, the Law of Nature, this same Law of Feudalism;—no right Aristocracy but a Land one! The curious are invited to meditate upon it in these days. Soldiering, Police and Judging, Church-Extension, nay real Government and Guidance, all this was actually *done* by the Holders of the Land in return for their Land. How much of it is now done by them; done by anybody? Good Heavens, 'Laissez-faire, Do ye nothing, eat your wages and sleep,' is everywhere the passionate half-wise cry of this time; and they will not so much as do nothing, but must do mere Corn-Laws! We raise fifty-two millions from the general mass of us, to get our Governing done—or, alas, to get ourselves persuaded that it is done; and the peculiar burden of the Land is to pay, not all this, but to pay, as I learn, one twenty-fourth part of all this. Our first Chartist Parliament, or Oliver Redivivus, you would say, will know where to lay the new taxes of England!—Or, alas, taxes? If we made the Holders of the Land pay every shilling still of the expense of Governing the Land, what were all that?"

Protests Against the Name Single Tax

THE following letter was addressed to the late Henry George Congress:

"I wish, at the Congress, some protest might be voiced as to the continued use of the term "Single Tax!" While it is correct as the ultimate issue of Henry George's principles, it is wholly misleading to the ordinary mind, trained as it has been, for immemorial centuries, to the idea that government, monarchical, oligarchic, republican, democratic, alike,—has the power and right to levy taxation upon *all* forms of property. Why, a man asks, confine taxation to any one kind of property? To such, the idea of a single tax is the "red-rag!" Why create an opposition that is useless when you have at hand a better term and its synonyms; namely, Natural Taxation, Taxation of Land Values, Taxation of the Site-Values of Land? Of course, *we* know that such taxation would inevitably eventuate in but *one* tax,—that of the *economic rent of land*,—the only public value that the community has any *moral right* to levy upon. But it is foolish to ignore the transi-

tional steps from general taxation to single tax; it is against the evolutionary order and law. Any *violent* attempt at variation of a given species in nature, means death; *gradual* change, adapted to the welfare of the species and the individuals hereof, means life and progress. Why not, then, be law-abiding? The chief adverse criticism I have to most reformers is, that they tend to jump too rapidly from Vision to Consummation. And I am of the opinion that Henry George's ideals have been too long held back by the insistence upon the term, "Single Tax," instead of using the term, "Natural Taxation." Place the first tax-levy upon the Site Value of Land; then, wait up on events.

I wish some such word could be read at the Congress, and set forth in LAND AND FREEDOM.

—A. W. LITTLEFIELD

Official Board Luncheon Meeting

HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, SEPT. 11.

THE annual meeting of the Board of Trustees and Advisory Commission of the Henry George Foundation at Chicago was very well attended, about thirty members being present at the luncheon on Tuesday at the Congress Hotel, with President George E. Evans in the chair.

Announcement was made of the election at the annual meeting of voting members held September 4th, of eight trustees, viz: Otto Cullman, George E. Evans, George P. Loomis, John Mellor, C. D. Scully, Carl D. Smith, George W. Wakefield and Hon. Charles O'Connor Hennessy. Messrs. Hennessy and Cullman are the new members of the board, the former having been chosen to fill the vacancy arising from the death of Senator Ferris of Michigan. One-third of the board of twenty-one are elected each year for a term of three years.

The trustees unanimously re-elected all of the officers who had served during the past year; President George E. Evans; Vice President, Joseph Dana Miller; Honorary Vice President, Mrs. Anna George de Mille; Treasurer, Wm. E. Schoyer; Executive Secretary, Percy R. Williams; Assistant Secretary, Francis W. Maguire.

In the election of the National Advisory Commission, a number of additions were made to the membership of this commission, including Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown, Dr. Frederick W. Roman, John Z. White, Ernest B. Gaston, Andrew P. Canning, A. Lawrence Smith, Mrs. Emily E. F. Skeel, Henry H. Hardinge, Clayton J. Ewing, George M. Strachan, Miss Mildred Tideman, Oliver T. Erickson, Barney Haughey, E. Stillman Doubleday, J. R. Hermann, George F. Cotterill, Fred T. Smith, August Williges, James H. McGill, Frederick F. Ingram, Jr., and Prof. Wm. H. Dinkins.

A resolution was adopted favoring Pittsburgh as the place of meeting for the Henry George Congress of 1929.

The Right of Revolution

THAT was an amazing proposal or suggestion submitted by the Mexican delegation to the Pan-American Conference which would have been tantamount to a declaration that an oppressed people does not have the right of revolution. It is surprising that as many as three nations, Nicaragua, Mexico and Salvador, supported such an idea. It is fortunate that others spoke out in forceful terms against a proposition that could only operate in the interest of tyrannies. It is remarkable that such a notion should have occurred to a single nation gathered at the Conference in Havana, because every one of them owes its existence as a nation to its resort to the right of revolution. But for that there would have been no Republic here, and all these other nations would be under the rule of Spain or Portugal. Of course the suggestion was frowned out of the Conference hall.

Our own contribution to this debate, on the part of Mr. Hughes, was merely to raise the point that the suggestion had nothing to do with the work on hand. No doubt the American delegation did not wish to become embroiled in a controversy. Even so, it seems that this Nation, born of revolution, might well have protested against serious consideration of such a plan of peace. It does not matter what Governments may decide, the peoples who constitute Governments will determine in such matters. The Congress of Vienna long ago attempted to outlaw revolutions and failed. The people governed will never abandon the right of revolution.

—N. Y. *Evening World*.

WHY pay rent when the same money will buy a home? Because it won't. No one ever suggests to a landlord; Why collect rent when you can let the same payments buy the home on installments?

PAUPERISM does not come from God. It is man's doing, and man's doing alone. God has abundantly supplied man with all the requisite means of support, and where he cannot find support we must look—not to the arrangements of the Almighty, but to the arrangements of men and to the mode in which they have portioned out the earth. There is enough for all, abundantly enough; and all that is requisite is freedom to labor on the soil and extract from it the produce that God intended for man's support.

—PATRICK EDWARD DOVE.

A FUNDAMENTAL principle of economics is that what a man produces by his unaided effort should be his, to enjoy and dispose of as he pleases, and that what the community produces by community effort should belong to all those who have aided in its creation.

It does not seem unjust that some share of the land values created by public initiative and investment should

be returned to the public through a higher tax on these values than is imposed on other ratables.

—From speech of WILLIAM L. DILL, Democratic nominee for governor, at Burlington, N. J., Oct. 9, 1928.

WHERE land is held out of use for speculative purposes no progress is possible, and it is more and more forced upon me that the time has come for a tax upon land values.

—HELEN HOPE in the *London Daily News*, September 25.

TO-DAY the genuinely one hundred per cent. Americans are on the list of suspects. Jane Addams, John Dewey, Father Ryan, John Haynes Holmes are considered as the sort of folk who need watching, because they believe in peace, or the equal rights of the foreign-born with natives before the law, or in the protection of foreign laborers. Those who struggle or argue for traditional American principles are seriously accused of being emissaries of Moscow and missionaries of Communism.—*The Churchman*.

“HOW far, O rich, do you extend your senseless avarice? Do you intend to be the sole inhabitants of the earth? Why do you drive out the fellow-sharers of Nature and claim it all for yourselves? The earth was made for all, rich and poor, in common. Why do ye claim it as your exclusive right? The soil was given to the rich and poor in common. Wherefore, O ye rich, do you unjustly claim it for yourselves alone? Nature gave all things in common for the use of all; usurpation created private rights. Property hath no rights. The earth is the Lord's and we are his offspring. The pagans hold earth as property. They do blaspheme God.”—*St. Ambrose (Latin, A. D. 340-397)*.

IT is, for instance, of no avail that thou worshippest Truth, if thou seest thy brother men ruled by Error, and dost not endeavor, so far as lies in thy power, to overcome that error.

—Mazzini.

“EVERY new truth has to fight its way into recognition. Ancient prejudices have to be overcome, but the struggle on your part develops all your latent powers.”—EUGENE V. DEBS.

UNRESTRICTED private property in land gives to individuals a large proportion of the wealth created by the community.

—ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE.

LAND never was property in that personal sense of property in which we speak of a thing as our own with which we may do as we please.

—J. A. FROUDE.

Further Messages to the Henry George Congress

We published in last issue extracts from letters and telegrams received by the Henry George Congress. Here are a few more omitted from our Sept.-Oct. number.

CABLE FROM LONDON: "Fraternal greetings from International Union and United Committee. Hearty welcome awaits large American delegation, Edinburgh, July, 1929."

CABLE FROM HARSSENS, DENMARK: "Danish Henry George Societies Annual Conference sends warmest greetings. More power to our cause."

JOSEPHUS DANIELS: "I wish it were possible for me to write that I should be present at the Congress, but engagements to which I have already committed myself are such that it will be impossible."

C. C. DILL, (U. S. Senator): "I regret exceedingly that it will be impossible for me to get away from the State of Washington in September, as I have a campaign coming on and must give all my attention to it."

JOHN R. COMMONS, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin: "I am much interested in your meeting of the Henry George Congress to be held in Chicago in September. Unfortunately, however, I cannot undertake any additional responsibilities or engagements at this time and must decline your kind invitation to speak at this meeting.

"I am sending you copies of bills and speeches which I have been at work on, along the line of the Henry George Foundation, in which you may be interested."

OLIVER T. ERICKSON, Member of City Council, Seattle, Wash.: "I have been hoping that some turn of the wheel might make it possible for me to attend the Congress at Chicago."

ORVILLE WRIGHT, Dayton, Ohio: "I thank you for your letter of July 10th extending to me an invitation to address the Henry George Annual Congress at Chicago. My inability as a public speaker would compel me to decline the invitation in any case. But my absence on a vacation at that time will prevent me from attending the Congress."

S. EDWARD WILLIAMS, Secretary Civic Chamber of Economics, San Francisco, Calif.: "No one would more appreciate the privilege of attending the Congress than I and if I were there it would probably be a hard matter to keep me from saying something, such is my natural bent. But it appears that it will be impossible for me to attend the Congress and I shall therefore have to content myself by reading about what the rest of you do. Perhaps the next Congress may find me differently situated."

HENRY WARE ALLEN, Wichita, Kas.: "It is always a pleasure to hear from you and I thank you for your favor of the 31st ult. Each year I hope that next time I will get to a conference but I must postpone my going this time. I had a fine letter from George Hughes of Topeka the other day and he is elated at the introduction again of the Single Tax idea in the British Parliament."

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, JR.: "I always find it difficult to decline an invitation to speak to the brethren of the Single Tax movement. If I were conscious of having a message that would be helpful or inspiring, I should certainly accept, but I cannot conscientiously do so when I should have only to repeat the truisms and arguments familiar to all my hearers. I shall, however, endeavor to get to Chicago at that time."

A. J. MILLIGAN, San Francisco, Calif.: "I am very sorry to be obliged to report that I will be unable to attend the convention. The Henry George Hotel is meeting with some success as a propaganda station. We will start schools this winter in an effort to produce some less timid economists. I personally believe that the mass of people

will not see the cat until we collect one hundred per cent. of the economic rent. I hope you will make room on your platform for those who believe in demanding the entire economic rent next Monday at nine o'clock. Please accept sincere thanks for your kind invitation to be one of your live wires who are doing so much for the noble cause."

ROBERT LAFOLLETTE, U. S. Senator from Wisconsin: "I would certainly like to be in position to accept your invitation to address the Henry George Congress when it meets in Chicago, but I am afraid it will be impossible for me to do so. I am in the midst of a campaign for re-election to the Senate and am devoting every moment of my time and strength to support of the progressive ticket which we hope to nominate on September 4th. We are battling a determined opposition and I am declining all invitations that will take me out of Wisconsin. I hope at another time, however, that I will be able to attend one of your meetings."

JOHN J. LENTZ, Columbus, Ohio: "Your kind invitation to address the Third Henry George Congress is laid before me this morning. My arrangements have been made to leave New York the 21st of July and I expect to be in Europe until October, making a study of governmental, economic and insurance questions. Thus you see it will be impossible for me to avail myself of the very greatest of privileges and I count it more than a privilege to meet you good people who will be doing the good work of the Henry George Congress."

W. E. MACKLIN, Alhambra, Calif.: "I am very sorry that I am so far away that I shall not be able to be in Chicago at the Henry George Congress. I thank you for your very cordial letter. I work for Single Tax all the time I can. It is the economic plank in my religious platform. It is the teaching of both the Old and New Testaments."

GEORGE W. NORRIS, U. S. Senator, Nebraska: "I regret that it will be impossible for me to be in Chicago for the Henry George Congress, much as I should like to attend your gathering."

Other cordial letters were received from Lawson Purdy, John J. Murphy, Arthur W. Roebuck, Frederic C. Leubuscher, Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of *The Christian Century*, Frederic C. Howe, Gerrit J. Johnson, J. R. Hermann, and many others.

Registration at Henry George Congress, Sept. 10, 11, 12, 1928

HERE is the registration secured at the Henry George Congress, 19 states represented, together with England, Germany, Alaska and Canada—not a bad showing. As we said in last issue some names were doubtless omitted despite the efforts of the Registration Committee, Miss Marien Tideman and John Lawrence Monroe.

Chas. R. Adair, Flint, Mich.; Mary A. Adair, Flint, Mich.; Brent Dow Allison, Ravinia, Ill.; E. W. Ashton, Chicago; Henry George Atkinson, Alpine, N. J.; Mrs. H. G. Atkinson, Alpine, N. J.; Will Atkinson, West Virginia.

Fred J. Bahni, Peoria, Ill.; H. Bates, Chicago; Ernest J. Batten, Chicago; Florence S. Bauer, Oak Park, Ill.; J. W. Bauer, Oak Park, Ill.; D. W. Beardsley, Ritta, Fla.; Herbert S. Bigelow, Cincinnati, O.; Thomas Birchler, Chicago; Ann Bittenbinder, Chicago; E. H. Boeck, St. Louis, Mo.; Mrs. E. H. Boeck, St. Louis, Mo.; Katherine E. Bradley, Olean, New York; Harry Gunnison Brown, Columbia, Mo.; Miss Marguerite Browne, Chicago; Miss Janet L. Brownlee, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Thos. L. Brunk, Alton, Ill.; Viggo Bunde, Chicago.

Joseph C. Campbell, Rochester, Pa.; Robert Campbell, Chicago; Nellie Carlin, Chicago; James Carson, Chicago; Eleanor Chambers, Chicago; Miss Queen Cheadle, Chicago; Chas. H. Ciliske, Chicago; Mrs. Chas. H. Ciliske, Chicago; Miss Eleanor Coddington, Chicago; J. W. Conners, Chicago; Thos. P. Craig, Colorado Sprgs., Col.; Mrs. Edith Croan, Chicago; Betty Cullman, Chicago; Otto Cullman, Chicago; Mrs. Otto Cullman, Chicago.

E. H. Dahl, Chicago; Wm. H. DeBillion, Chicago; Anna George deMille, New York City; S. T. Densmore, Elkhart, Ind.; E. R. Derickson, Chicago; H. W. Donaldson, Chicago; Mrs. V. E. duChoine, Fairhope, Ala.; Miss Frances L. Dusenberry, Chicago.

Chas. R. Eames, Elgin, Ill.; Charles R. Eckert, Beaver, Pa.; Clara H. Eckert, Beaver, Pa.; Frederick F. Engelke, Chicago; Wilhelmine Engelke, Germany; George E. Evans, Pittsburgh, Pa.; C. J. Ewing, Chicago.

Herman Forel, Chicago; A. D. Foyer, Evanston, Ill.; Ann Franklin, Chicago; Malcolm Franklin, Chicago.

E. B. Gaston, Fairhope, Ala.; Wilson L. Gill, Mt. Airy, Phila., Pa.; Agnes Goedde, Chicago; Edward C. Goedde, Chicago; Florence Goedde, Chicago; Norma Goedde, Chicago; C. LeBaron Goeller, Union, Broome Co., N. Y.; John H. Gordon, Chicago; Alexander Greene, Chicago; Esther A. Grove, Chicago.

R. Hackett, Chicago; J. A. Hamm, Enid, Okla.; H. Hansen, Chicago; Florence Curtis Hansen, Chicago; Henry H. Hardinge, Chicago; John Harrington, Oshkosh, Wis.; Charles H. Hartman, Chicago; Mrs. Henry Hecht, Chicago; Leo Heller, Chicago; Mollie Heller, Chicago; Charles O'Connor Hennessy, New York City; Mrs. Chas. O'Connor Hennessy, New York City; J. H. Hensen, Grand Rapids, Mich.; James E. Hoenni, Chicago; Mrs. Loraine Hoenni, Chicago; W. H. Holly, Chicago; Winthrop H. Hopkins, Chicago; Charles Horn, Chicago; Edwin A. Howes, Chicago; Mrs. Edwin A. Howes, Chicago; Gizella I. Huber, Chicago; N. H. Hyde, Manchester, Iowa; Mrs. N. H. Hyde, Manchester, Iowa.

J. A. Johnson, Chicago; Emil O. Jorgenson, Chicago; Mrs. E. O. Jorgenson, Chicago; J. P. Joyenson, Chicago.

Erwin Kauffman, St. Louis, Mo.; R. Stephen Keller, Chicago; Dr. T. J. Kelley, Marathon, Iowa; Chas. Klebanaw, Chicago; Leo R. Klinge, Chicago; Benj. F. Krisher, Chicago; Ida Krisher, Chicago.

W. D. Lamb, Chicago; L. V. LaTaste, Dallas, Texas; W. J. Leary, Chicago; Cornelius Leenhouts, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Cornelius Leenhouts, Milwaukee, Wis.; Fay Lewis, Rockford, Ill.; J. C. Lincoln, Cleveland, O.; Chas. Lischer, St. Louis, Mo.; Morris D. A. Lynchenheim, Chicago.

R. C. Macauley, Phila., Pa.; Mrs. Leah D. Maclachlan, Chicago; George C. Madison, Chicago; F. W. Maguire, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. Grace Malensek, Chicago; Darwin D. Martin, Buffalo, N. Y.; Mrs. Henry Martin, Chicago; J. D. Martin, Elgin, Ill.; W. E. Martin, Oak Park, Ill.; Helena Mitchell McEvoy, Douglas Island, Alaska; Allen Menger, Chicago; G. A. Menger, St. Louis, Mo.; Thos. A. Meyer, Chicago; Mrs. Thos. A. Meyer, Chicago; E. W. Meyers, Chicago; Frank Millar, Chicago; Walter Millard, Cincinnati, O.; Joseph Dana Miller, N. Y. City; Mark Millikin, Hamilton, O.; Wiley Wright Mills, Chicago; E. C. Moeller, Chicago; Aage Moller, Danneborg, Nebr.; Dr. Eugene Monahan, Chicago; F. H. Monroe, Chicago; John Lawrence Monroe, Palos Park, Ill.; Irene S. Monroe, Palos Park, Ill.; Dr. Morrison, Chicago; J. L. Murray, Chicago.

M. J. Neylor, Chicago.

Geo. C. Olcott, Chicago; Mrs. Dorothy M. Olcott, Chicago.

Mrs. Henrietta Palmer, Evanston, Ill.; Helen B. Paulsen, Chicago; N. B. Paulsen, Chicago; Alex. Pernod, So. Chicago; D. H. Parkins, Evanston, Ill.

T. P. Quinn, Chicago.

Billy, S. T. Radcliffe, Cleveland, O.; Julius J. Reiter, Rochester, Minn.; Ray Robson, Lansing, Mich.; Mrs. Ray Robson, Lansing, Mich.; Thos. Rhodus, Chicago; Charles B. Rogers, Wisconsin; Henry E. Rohn, Chicago; F. W. Roman, Los Angeles, Calif.; Vernon J. Rose, Kansas City, Mo.; Thos. Ryan, Chicago.

Theodore R. M. Saunders, Chicago; Mary Scanlan, Chicago; Dorothea C. Scheer, Chicago; Fred Schermerhorn, Gladbrook, Iowa; Mrs. Floy Mann Schermerhorn, Gladbrook, Iowa; Charlotte O. Schetter, New York City; Ferdinand Schevill, Chicago; Geo. A. Schill-

ing, Chicago; Emily E. F. Skeel, Vineyard Haven, Mass.; Jessie Skinner, Wilmette, Ill.; A. Lawrence Smith, Detroit, Mich.; Carl D. Smith, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Charles E. Snyder, Sioux City, Iowa; S. S. Stanger, Ravinia, Ill.; L. A. Stebbins, Chicago; Mrs. L. A. Stebbins, Chicago; Frank Stephens, Arden, Del.; S. A. Stockwell, Minneapolis, Minn.; George M. Strachan, Chicago.

Velma Tamme, Chicago; Alan Thompson, Toronto, Canada; Carl D. Thompson, Chicago; Mrs. E. Tideman, Forest Pk., Ill.; Eunice Tideman, Chicago; Florence Tideman, Wilmette, Ill.; George Tideman, Chicago; Henry L. T. Tideman, Chicago; Mrs. Henry Tideman, Chicago; H. P. T. Tideman, Chicago; Lillian N. Tideman, Chicago; Marien Tideman, Chicago; Mildred Tideman, Wilmette, Ill.; S. Tideman, Fisk, Mo.; S. N. Tideman, Wilmette, Ill.; Mrs. S. N. Tideman, Wilmette, Ill.; O. A. Toeppert, Cincinnati, O.

Edwin L. Upp, Gary, Ind.; Mrs. Edwin Upp, Gary, Ind.

Dr. Walter Verity, Chicago; Henry Vick, Chicago; Mrs. Jos. S. Vinci, Chicago.

Fiske Warren, Harvard, Mass.; M. Warriner, Kingston on Thames, Surrey, England; John Weiler, Chicago; Arthur H. Westine, Chicago; Edward White, Kansas City, Mo.; John Z. White, Chicago; Mrs. H. Wilde, Chicago; P. R. Williams, Pittsburgh, Pa.; August Williges, Iowa; Helena Williges, Sioux City, Iowa; James E. Wilson, Chicago; F. A. Wise, Chicago; Mrs. F. A. Wise, Chicago; Walter S. Wright, Kansas City, Mo.

BOOK REVIEWS

REMEDY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

"The apparel oft proclaims the man," says the poet, and this is also true concerning the inward man,—his business in life, his antecedents, his training in a certain circle of society. So we find the author of this book to be "a successful manufacturer, inventor and business man." As a corollary to this a reading of the book shows that he is not a scientist or scientific thinker (philosopher), and since he displays ignorance of the very elements of the Science of Political Economy, about which his book is written, we find that his deductions are worse than useless in that they will lead many untrained readers further and further into the mire. It is one of those books that might better never have been written.

Well toward the end of the book (p. 94) we find these words: "The ignorance and shortsightedness of those who framed our banking laws—or rather those who have practically copied these laws from Europe—are alone responsible for unemployment."

This is Mr. Bilgram's conclusion, arrived at without any science, and in a reverse manner—that is, plunging into the intricacies of the subject without even suggesting the elements, from which all scientific research begins.

The book purports to give the remedy for "overproduction, (?) and unemployment"—with thousands of people suffering for lack of the things that have been produced too abundantly. It starts (Introduction) with "the causes of overproduction." Sec. 2, is "inconsistency of terms;" then comes "money," then "credit;" a little further on comes "the scarcity of money;" "the production of money;" "The Remedy; Plan one and plan two." The last subject is "The Land Question" followed by the conclusion and an appendix.

The most casual glance will show the student of Political Economy that the procedure is unscientific and goes at the subject hind-end-to. That the conclusions are absurd necessarily follows because the conclusions can never be more accurate than the premises of an argument. And one of the paradoxes of the human mind is that in scarcely any other field of science,—mathematics, astronomy, chemistry, etc.—would a writer dare plunge into the middle of a subject while ignoring and virtually denying, all of the elements of the science upon which the superstructure must rest.

*The Remedy for Overproduction and Unemployment. By Hugo Bilgram. Vanguard Press, New York. Price, 50 Cents.

Mr. Bilgram and all other writers on the subject must be scientific if they hope to reach conclusions of any value.

Therefore the author should have started with the land question instead of leaving it until last. He should have borne in mind that land is the first PRIME factor in the production of ALL wealth. Labor is the second PRIME factor in production. Capital is the third but a secondary factor in production and consists of wealth (not money, for money is merely a yard stick of values, and the common medium of exchange) produced from land by labor and has comparatively little weight compared with the prime importance of land and labor. Money can be ignored in the early stages of the investigation, for while it is of great importance it is as nothing compared with two prime factors of production, land and labor. The author treats of money first and land last whereas he should have reversed the order.

The author should have told that all labor acts directly or indirectly upon land. The banker, and the "successful manufacturer," the sailor and the aviator, all use land every minute that they live, awake or asleep, and the body of each and every one finally goes back to the land whence it came. Ships on the ocean rest on water that rests upon land, and air planes move upon air that rests upon land. Every human activity is performed upon the surface of the earth, i.e. land. Land is the all-important factor in the life of mankind, this last word falling under the term labor. "The ownership of land gives the ownership of men, to a degree, measured by the necessity, real or artificial, for the use of land. Place one hundred men upon an island from which there is no escape and whether you make one of them the absolute owner of the other ninety-nine, or the absolute owner of the soil of the island will make no difference either to him or to them."

Therefore the warning: If a writer on a Politico-Economic subject fails to place land first, labor second, and capital third, you may be sure that the book is of comparatively little value and must be looked upon with suspicion. This is true of Karl Marx and many other writers. Marx wrote, "Wage, Labor and Capital," (Pub. Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chgo.) and instantly we should note the fact that the title should have been either, "Land, Labor and Capital" or "Rent, Wages and Interest." Then in reading the pamphlet we are justified in our suspicions. Marx was empirical (the opposite of scientific) and arrives at no true conclusions, though he says many things that are certainly true, but are not properly related to the other truths of Political Economy.

C. LEB. GOELLER.

B. H. NADAL CULTIVATES THE FAIRIES*

It is not easy to write for children; if any one thinks it is let him try it. Mr. Nadal has, we think, succeeded. He has not made the mistake of writing below the youthful mind. He has assumed that children will understand some things which to the mature mind require a lot of explanation. He thinks that beneath the surface of fairy life the subtlest lessons in human behavior may be conveyed to the child mind. We should like to try it out on some children of our acquaintance.

Mr. Nadal is an old Single Taxer, a long-time member of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, and the author of "Woodmites," recently produced in a New York Theatre. The volume before us is pretty and attractive, and the illustrations, which are very charming, are by R. F. Bunner, of the Salmagundi Club, who is the brother of the late H. C. Bunner, once editor of *Puck*, who is pleasantly remembered by this reviewer. The book makes an attractive Christmas present. (See adv.).—

J. D. M.

GREGORY WEINSTEIN RECALLS THE EIGHTIES*

Mr. Weinstein's reminiscences are of vivid interest. He was part of the events he describes. He knew intimately these leaders of the

*The Fairy Court, or Judge Weeks and Her Friends. By B. H. Nadal. Illustrated by R. F. Bunner. Cloth, 118 pages. Price \$1.50. The Avondale Press, N. Y. City.

*The Ardent Eighties. By Gregory Weinstein. Cloth, illustrated. 182 pages; price, \$2.50. The International Press, N. Y. City.

movements of the Eighties, Henry George, Father McGlynn, Josephine Shaw Lowell, James Redpath, and many others. His own life was passed among the stirring events he recounts.

Mr. Weinstein was a child of the Russian pogroms. He describes the slaughter of thousands of Jews in his native Russia, the raids made upon his own home in search for forbidden books, and finally the enthralling vision of America, the land of the free, and the final escape of himself and his family into Germany, and thence to the land of promise through the gates of Castle Garden.

But he was soon to be disillusioned. The land of promise was not all it had been pictured. The green hills and valleys of his old home in Vilna were at least preferable to the dark tenements and filthy streets of New York's lower East Side.

Finally he drifted into the printing trade. He worked for Norman L. Munro among others, (Mr. Munro was then publisher of the *Family Story Paper*, a widely circulated fiction weekly), then at Polhemus' on the corner of Ann and Nassau streets, and later on the *Leader* of which Louis Post was editor, a paper started mainly to help Henry George in his campaign for the mayoralty of New York. He then drifted into reportorial work and finally back again to his old trade of setting type. It is interesting to note that he sought and obtained work on Henry George's *Standard*. William McCabe was foreman of the composing room.

Mr. Weinstein tells interestingly of Shevitch, whose famous debate with Henry George, in which encounter Henry George was not at his best, will be recalled.

The chapter treating of Henry George begins: "In all my recollections of the decade of the Eighties I can hardly recall a man who has left a deeper impress on his generation than Henry George. Even thirty years after his death, his name is revered by many loyal followers and his books are read all over the civilized world."

Mr. Weinstein is not a Single Taxer, but evidently believes that George's remedy will go far toward solving the land and taxation problems while leaving other evils in our "highly complicated industrial life" to be cured by different methods. Evidently Mr. Weinstein, like so many others, does not see the far reaching nature of the proposal which goes a great way toward solving other questions beside the land and taxation questions.

It is a graceful tribute that our author pays to Miss Lillian D. Wald, founder of the Henry Street Settlement, and he links her name with that of Jane Adams, whom he calls "Chicago's greatest woman." Equally to be commended for its fine appreciation and general accuracy—and it would do no harm for certain ill-informed Catholic editors to read it—is Mr. Weinstein's sketch of Father McGlynn.

There are others in this volume to whom we are re-introduced, these devoted souls of the "ardent eighties"—it is a happy title that Mr. Weinstein has selected for his book—Felix Adler, Ernest Howard Crosby, Stanton Coit, Joseph Barondess, and many more. Of these we may say in the language of our author, "They did not live in vain." And not in vain has our author gathered together these memories of his time and the fine spirits with whom he mingled. "Show me the company you keep and I will show you what you are." And it must be a source of gratification to Mr. Weinstein that this was the company he sought. We thank him sincerely for this volume.

J. D. M.

BRAND WHITLOCK WRITES A POLITICAL NOVEL*

If American politics is anything like the thing Brand Whitlock pictures it, then right thinking, right living men will hesitate to adopt it as a profession. And it is like that. Mr. Whitlock strips it of all its garish attractions and presents it as the sordid thing it is.

Do we doubt it? Have we not been through a presidential campaign in which the all too obvious sacrifice of principle and personal conviction on the part of very esteemed and eminent persons in political

*Big Mat. By Brand Whitlock. Cloth, 284 pages, price, \$2. D. Appleton and Co., N. Y. City.

life has marked its progress? We have witnessed appeals to prejudice and hatreds; we have, in view of the curious comedy performed by people and politicians in a campaign remarkable for its silliness, grown almost to distrust whether government is worth maintaining at such a sacrifice of reason and sanity, and to wonder if the philosophic anarchist may not after all be right in his contention that the game is not worth the candle.

Mr. Whitlock has told the tragedy of it, in a remarkable series of pictures that would lend themselves well to story form for a stage or film play. What politics may do to the human soul, how the very qualities of loyalty and friendship which we so highly esteem, may be bent to the service of political corruption and the destruction of official integrity, is told well and effectively.

Almost every one knows that the picture given is a true one. And most men in increasing numbers seem to accept the entangling alliances of government and political corruption as inevitable. But it is not really so. Most of the temptations that beset politics can be removed. The sources of political corruption are traceable to privilege. Our late minister of Belgium is a believer in the philosophy of Henry George, and knows the answer to the problem that he presents in the guise of fiction. He has not indicated anything fundamental but he has told an effective story well worth reading, and the discerning reader may beneath its fictional covering discover why men who follow politics put their immortal souls in peril.

J. D. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

ALMOST RIGHT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your *Dearborn Independent* article, "Has The Single Tax Made Progress," is good, and I am using it in what work I am doing in Dallas, but there is a fly in the ointment which I wish might be removed. You close your excellent article with a confession (following in the footsteps of our illustrious leader, Henry George) that we do not really believe in our cause. "The time when the entire rental value of land will be taken for public purposes may be a long way off," etc. Page 499, *Progress and Poverty*, Mr. George says:

"Will it at length prevail? Ultimately, yes, But in our times, or in times in which any memory of us remains, who shall say?" Expressions like this indicate, if they do not prove, that we do not believe in our cause. If the absorption of economic rent is legalized theft, why not say so, and why not keep on saying so, instead of conceding that we do not expect our claims to be recognized, and that right now? For more than a half century we have been "studying the Single Tax," as if it required a Ph. D. to understand it, instead of crying "Stop Thief," and demanding insistently, a revision of our laws to the end that he who creates shall have. Too much didactics and too little straight from the shoulder pick handle work at the ballot box. Am I not almost right?

Dallas, Texas.

L. V. LATASTE.

[The Editor of LAND AND FREEDOM may err with Henry George in placing at an uncertain date the time when the entire rental value of land is taken for public purposes. And it may be questionable whether it is wise to hint that the ultimate realization will take some time. But it by no means follows that this is a confession that we do not believe in the cause we are advocating. The cause will ultimately prevail; nothing can stop it, though many things may temporarily arrest its progress. But we cheerfully concede that our Dallas brother may be almost right.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.]

NO TAXES FOR THE FARMER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

On page 59 of the *Saturday Evening Post* it is said: "The land is both the blessing and the curse of the farmer. The trouble with it is

it's there so everybody can see it, and whatever it can see government wants to tax. But the foolishness of taxing land on its value is that sometimes it is worth its value and sometimes it isn't, depending on the crop. The value of the land is fixed, but the farmer's income is far from steady. The burden of the farmer's taxes at present is not how much he has to pay but that he has to pay when he hasn't got it. The sensible principle would seem to be to tax the farmer on what he really earns, not what he *might* earn."

The author, Mr. O. H. Cheney, has forgotten that those who advocate "taxing the land on its value" seek also to abolish all taxes save those levied upon land values.

He is right when he confesses: "How can you, the farmer, decrease your costs? Your present prices on the things you have to buy for the farm figure about 45 per cent. above pre-war levels. I do not see how this can be expected to decrease to any extent in any short time."

Yet he does see that all the taxes, save the land value tax, make the farmer, surely the majority of the farmers, pay more than they can afford to pay. The burden of indirect taxation is much heavier than that of the taxes paid by the farmer directly. And indirectly taxes which increase the price of goods fall more heavily on the farmer at the margin (that is, he who is using the poorest land) for he has to pay the same prices for what he buys as does the farmer who cultivates the most fertile and valuable land. Only land value taxation will enable governments to abolish present taxes so that prices can be expected to decrease below the pre-war level. Only land value taxation can assure to the farmer who really earns only the wages of his labor that he will not have to pay any tax, and to every prospective farmer that he will never be called upon to pay anything from his real earnings.

Athens, Greece

ING. PAVLOS GIANNELIA.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

CHARLES F. BRUSH, famous in the art of electric lighting, and a Cleveland multimillionaire landowner, is alarmed over future poverty rather than the poverty that can be seen all around us today. He has the Malthusian theory fast in his mind and says that "within one hundred years, if the present increase of population goes on, some of us will starve to death." Bishop Joseph Schrems, of the Catholic diocese, ridicules Brush's ideas. He says of himself that he is the youngest of 16 children and that if the eugenic plan of limiting population had been in vogue, he would have stood a poor chance of surviving. He declares that his life has been a happy one, and he is not sorry to be here. However his argument against Brush does not touch the science of political economy but is based solely on religion.

It is grateful news to Single Taxers throughout the world that John Paul editor of *Land and Liberty*, of London, England, is making steady improvement in health.

Land and Liberty highly commends *Spiritual Economics*, by John Emery McLean, of Fairhope, Alabama, published by the Henry George Foundation at Pittsburgh.

OUR esteemed contemporary, the *Commonweal*, of London, in its issue of September 29 reprints from the July-August issue of LAND AND FREEDOM the admirable review of Shaw's book on Socialism by Benjamin W. Burger.

GEORGE ASHER BEECHER is writing admirable contributed editorials for the Warren, Pa., *Evening Times*.

MARK M. DINTENFASS, commenting on a portion of a speech by the late democratic candidate for governor in New Jersey, William L. Dill, printed elsewhere in this issue, says in the *Palisadian* under

date of October 31: "It is gratifying to know that a candidate for the highest office in the state sees the reasonableness of making these social values that attach to land pay some portion of the public revenues and to relieve industry and homes in some measure of the burdens that are entailed by present methods of taxation." We are sorry that Mr. Dill lost to his republican opponent.

THE Henry George Club of Pittsburgh is now headed by William N. McNair as president, G. W. Wakefield, vice president, Ralph E. Smith, treasurer and F. W. Maguire, secretary.

ANOTHER veteran Single Taxer has passed away in the person of Robert Seibert, of St. Paul, Minn. He had long been active in the movement and was instrumental in securing speaking dates for John Z. White, Herbert Bigelow, George H. Duncan and others through the years. He was in love with Fairhope, where he spent many pleasant days and looked forward to spending his declining years. A disciple of Thomas Paine, to do good working for social justice was the motivating force in his long and active life. As late as October 31st, he had a letter in the *St. Paul Dispatch* presenting the real remedy for unemployment. He died after an illness of a few days at the age of 69. He was one of the pioneer sash and door manufacturers of the Northwest. He is survived by his widow and three children. He was widely known to his fellow workers in the cause of industrial emancipation.

OUR Field Lecturer Hon. George H. Duncan, has just had two great compliments paid him—one is being asked to address the Assessors of New Hampshire—about 500 strong—at their annual meeting on the subject "Is The Single Tax Practical" selected by themselves; and the other is to address the Farm Labor Bureau of the U. S. at their annual meeting in Chicago, in December on the subject, "The Farmer and His Taxes."

These invitations did not come through any Single Taxer. They just prove what the educational work has done these past years for the movement. When a vast body like The Farm Bureau asks to have them addressed on the subject of "The Farmer and his Taxes," Behold, the light must be breaking.

THE death of Dr. Frank Crane, at Nice, France, at the age of 67 is announced. Dr. Crane was an ordained Methodist minister, but left the ministry to enter journalism. He made an almost immediate success. He probably reached more readers with his syndicated daily "sermons" than any man writing in the world today. His articles were notable neither for originality nor profundity, but little exception could be found with most of his conclusions. He was a Single Taxer in his economic convictions as far as he can be said to have gone though he made occasional lapses from straight thinking on the subject. We are indebted to him, however, for a number of endorsements of our principles which appeared from his pen, together with appreciative notices of Henry George and his place in history.

The Daily Graphic, a widely circulated tabloid newspaper of this city, is running a series of Famous Love Letters. On November 1st a letter of Henry George to his wife appears culled from the Life of Henry George by his son.

CALVIN BLYTHE POWER, our old friend and veteran Single Taxer, writes us from Fayette City, Pa.: "I am ninety-one years old and have never been sick in my life." Congratulations! Mr. Power writes us an interesting letter and his penmanship is as firm as that of John Filmer, who is also ninety-one. And the intellectual processes of both function better than half the college professors and all the statesmen we are afflicted with.

JAMES R. BROWN, President of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, spoke recently before the Nassau Bankers' Round Table, a section of the American Institute of Banking.

A RECENT dinner of the Single Tax Association of Canada listened to addresses from Stanley T. Floyd, R. J. Deachman and others. Mr. Deachman, who is secretary of the Consumers League of Canada, talked on the tariff, and said, "Manufacturers were always asking for duties on somebody else's raw material and striving to get their own in dutyless." The newly elected officers of the Single Tax Association of Canada are W. A. Douglass, Honorary President; Dr. Stanley T. Floyd, president; Prof. John McGowan, vice president, Lorenzo B. Walling, secretary; Walter J. Ingham, associate secretary and Allan C. Thompson, treasurer.

A NOTABLE victory was won for the extension of the graded tax plan to other cities of Pennsylvania when the Convention of the League of Cities of the Third Class met at New Castle, Pa., on September 20. The case for the Pittsburgh graded tax plan was presented by Percy R. Williams. The Convention adopted unanimously a resolution endorsing the half rate tax on improvements, which has aroused much interest in the state.

The Square Deal, of Toronto, Canada, for Sept-Oct., which by the way is an exceedingly interesting number, complains that the programme of the late Henry George Congress was too full, and that too little time was allowed for discussion. We think our contemporary is right. But we must learn by experience.

P. W. SCHWANDER, ("Horatio") of Houston, Texas, writes: "Your pamphlet, 'Has the Single Tax Made Progress?' is good stuff. I think the boys are making a mistake if they fail to circulate it."

THE Henry George Birthday celebration held in Providence, R. I. in Sept. last is declared to have been the most successful Single Tax gathering ever held in that city. So at least says former Alderman John Kelso. Mayor James E. Dunner, of Providence, said that in years to come the Single Tax plan may solve our problem of raising public revenue. David S. Fraser acted as toastmaster, and among the speakers were John T. Giddings, Granville Standish, James A. Doran, S. I. Randall, Harry Thomas, and William J. MacDugald. There was a large attendance.

MR. H. W. FIELDING, of Chester, Va., sends us a work on Civics by Messrs. Burch & Patterson in use in the high schools of Virginia. Chapter XXVII under the heading "Proposed Economic Reconstruction of the State," treats of the Single Tax and Socialism, giving the reasons pro and con. The argument is a fair statement of our principles and the reasons in opposition are the current ones. We may say that the real office of a text book is to give both sides and let the pupil make up his mind. If all text books were of this character we should have little ground for complaint.

EDWARD WHITE, of Kansas City, Mo., on his way back from the Henry George Congress at Chicago hopped off at Columbia, Mo., where he had a very pleasant visit with Prof. Brown and family. Mr. White is interested in having Prof. Brown address the Chamber of Congress of Kansas City.

THE Liberal Church, of Denver, Colorado, (Frank H. Rice, Pres.) has conferred upon George Edward Evans, P. R. Williams and Clayton J. Ewing the degree of Doctor of the Henry George Philosophy.

WE hope none of our readers will neglect the address of Clayton J. Ewing at the Henry George Congress printed elsewhere in this issue.

It is no idle compliment to say that if Henry George had not written his great address on Moses Mr. Ewing might have done so!

NEW YORK Single Taxers will remember Dr. S. A. Schneidman, who was active and devoted in his work for the cause. He is now head of the Modern Pet Hospital on Long Island. A recent issue of the *National Business Review* gives an interesting sketch of the doctor and the institution over which he presides.

THE Freeland Club, of Los Angeles, had as a guest and speaker Mr. M. Warriner on October 20. On October 28 the Club had a picnic with a very full programme. The president, Chas. James, Dr. Henry Frank and Prof. Roman were speakers.

MR. MONROE of the Henry George Lecture Association has bought a new Ford Sedan and intends to make a special tour of the country, visiting the libraries of the United States. The work has been gradually developing for several years and Mr. Monroe feels that this storming of the libraries can be made an important part of our educational work. It is twenty-five years since the Henry George Lecture Association was launched.

THE Ithaca *Journal-News* of recent date contains an excellent letter on "Monopolies and the Farmer" by C. H. Baidon. Mr. Baidon is himself a farmer of long experience.

THE *Ohio State Journal* has many a Single Tax letter from Matthew Haas which is the nom-de-plume of George J. Foyer, our old friend of Cleveland, Ohio. We wish we had space to reprint some of these. Many of our friends are doing good work with their letters to the press and none better than Brother Foyer.

SENATOR JOHN M. QUINN, of New York, speaking in Los Angeles, said: "Hoover thinks that Boulder Dam should be controlled by the Power Trust, forgetting that it is a natural resource. I believe that all natural resources belong to the people and should be controlled by the people, because God has given the natural resources to all the people. It is a gift of God to all the people." We do not know how much of this Senator Quinn really believes; his record rather negatives it, but we are nevertheless rather glad to hear him say it.

WE acknowledge receipt of a neatly printed little volume, "How to Become a Christian," by Walter M. Thornton, of 609 Grand Avenue, of Los Angeles, California. Mr. Thornton writes that "Some of the dearest memories I have are of the devoted, morally heroic Single Taxers." The book is published by the Frank H. Revell Co., of 158 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. City, and is sold for 66 cents postpaid.

A POEM having a real swing to it and written by Warren Worth Bailey, Jr., son of the late editor of the *Johnstown Democrat*, appeared in a recent issue of that paper and is reprinted in *Labor*, of Washington, D. C. Young Mr. Bailey has a talent worth cultivating.

WE reviewed in a recent issue of LAND AND FREEDOM the poems of the mother of Iona Inghan Robinson. Mrs. Robinson has a few more copies left, and we think our friends would like to have this book with its serene graceful tributes to so many of those whose names are familiar to Henry George men.

THE Library of the University of South Dakota (Vermillion, S. D.) is in need of Jan.-Feb. 1927, issue of LAND AND FREEDOM (No. 140) Will some of our readers who can spare a copy for the Library communicate with the Librarian.

THE Greenwich Village Historical Society of this city listened to an address from George Lloyd on the evening of October 9. Interested and intelligent questions were asked at the close and Mr. Lloyd was invited to come again. Our local readers are asked to note that Mr. Lloyd talks over Radio W. P. C. H. on Saturdays.

WE had received from Mr. Pavlos Gianelia a translation made by him into Greek of the Address from the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade to the World Economic Conference at Geneva convened by the League of Nations in 1927. The title of the Address as our readers know is "The Economic Causes of War and Industrial Depression." Mr. Gianelia is an accredited representative from Athens to the government at Vienna.

STATEMENT of the Ownership, Management, Circulation, etc., required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, of LAND AND FREEDOM, published Bi-Monthly at New York, N. Y., for October, 1928, State of New York, County of New York, ss.:

Before me, a notary in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Joseph Dana Miller, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Editor of LAND AND FREEDOM and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in Section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor and managing editor and business managers are:

Publisher: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

Editor: Joseph Dana Miller, 150 Nassau St., New York City.

Managing Editor: Joseph Dana Miller, 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

Business Manager: Joseph Dana Miller, 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

2. That the owners are: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., Herman G. Loew, Pres., George R. Macey, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, New York City. None but Joseph Dana Miller own one per cent. or more of stock.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: none.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stocks, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER,

EDITOR.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of September, 1928.

[Seal]

LOUIS D. SCHWARTZ, Notary Public
New York County.