

January—February, 1929

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Agricultural Distress; Its Cause and Remedy

C. H. Baidon

False Education in Our Colleges

E. O. Jorgensen

Warren Worth Bailey

John Lawrence Monroe

Recent Editorials on Henry George
and His Teachings

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

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.

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1929

VOL. XXIX

No. 1. WHOLE No. 152

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.....	3
A REAL LAND VICTORY ON LONG ISLAND.....	5
FRANK STEPHENS ON DEMOCRACY.....	6
PITTSBURGH PREPARES TO ENTERTAIN THE FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE.....	7
AGRICULTURAL DISTRESS, ITS CAUSE AND REMEDY	8
.....C. H. Baidon	8
OWNERSHIP OF THE ETHER LANES....	10
.....Chas. G. Baldwin	10
WARREN WORTH BAILEY, DEMOCRATIC JOURNALIST	11
.....John Lawrence Monroe	11
A LATTER-DAY DAVID.....	13
.....Editorial Boston Globe	13
A LESSON FROM HENRY GEORGE.....	14
.....Editorial Toledo Sunday Times	14
JERSEY TAX INJUSTICE....	15
.....Editorial Camden Evening Courier	15
FARMERS TURNING TO US....	15
.....Editorial Rural New Yorker	15
WHAT AILS THE THEATRE.....	16
.....James R. Brown	16
FALSE EDUCATION IN OUR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.....	17
.....E. O. Jorgensen	17
ADDRESS OF C. LEBARON GOELLER.....	20
THE PROGRESS OF THE AGES.....	23
.....K. P. Alexander	23
BOOK REVIEWS.....	27
CORRESPONDENCE.....	28
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	29

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

127

VOL. XXIX

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1929

No. 1

Comment and Reflection

DO they change, these Labor Leaders? They do not. Since the destruction by the mob led by the labor agitators of Lancashire of the factory erected by Sir Richard Arkwright in 1774, they have not changed. The leaders of the labor movement remain the same ignorant and stupid supporters of reaction and blind conservatism

WE are moved to write thus by the latest declaration from Mr. Green, head of the American Federation of Labor, who is quoted by the press to the following effect:

If we must choose between scrapping machines and science and scrapping human beings, we must scrap the machinery in favor of men and women with minds and souls. What will happen when we meet the point of saturation? Will we eventually reach an all-mechanical age, an age when only machines will be in demand and men will not be wanted? This can never be.

IT is now nearly fifty years since Terence V. Powderly, a prominent labor leader of the time and head of the Knights of Labor, declared that he made it a practise of breaking soda bottles whenever he bought a glass of soda in order to provide employment for the bottle makers! Henry George rebuked him at the time. To the present head of the American Federation Mr. Fred. S. Wallace, of the *Daily Tribune*, of Coshocton, Ohio, administers a mild but none the less effective castigation. We quote:

That these beliefs should persist until now in spite of abounding proof that the inventive faculty implanted in man is not a curse and that labor saving machinery is a help and not a hindrance to the onward march of the race, is proof of the power of wrong economic teaching to survive generation after generation and of the ominous fact that appeals to men's prejudice and selfishness are more powerful than appeals to their reason and the plain manifestations of science. That the rank and file of labor should still entertain delusions of this character is less surprising than that men of Mr. Green's caliber should give them credence. It is all a part of those economic fallacies which gave birth to the Malthusian theory and which still lead even a majority of people to believe that "protective" tariffs in some mysterious way add to the earnings of labor, whether in the factory or on the farm.

AND in order that Mr. Green should be informed of some very significant facts that as head of the American Federation he should know, Mr. Wallace prints a table

which we trust Mr. Green will prayerfully consider: Mr. Wallace says:

It is the appropriation of this publicly created value by less than five per cent. of our population that is responsible for the ills of which Mr. Green complains and not until this exploitation is stopped can there be any hope for the better day which he so earnestly and properly bespeaks. As a concrete illustration of the real source of the trouble let the following figures taken from statistics compiled by the federal Census Bureau be presented to the American Federation of Labor. These figures tell exactly where the trouble lies. They show that in production costs legitimate capital even more than labor is being victimized by social parasites who reap without sowing and are a menace to the natural development of civilization:

Year	Pct. of Wages Cost	Pct. of Capital Cost	Pct. of Capital and Wages Cost	Pct. of Land Value Cost	Total Cost
1870	52	42	94	6	100
1880	37	34	71	29	100
1890	32	16	48	52	100
1900	28	10	38	62	100
1905	26	8	34	66	100
1910	24	7	31	69	100
1920	23	5	28	72	100

Do not these figures reveal ominously yet accurately what is resulting from our insane flouting of the natural economic law? Do they contain no lesson for the American Federation of Labor and every other patriotic group that would save individualism, private initiative and what is left of our democracy from the economic sink hole into which is pouring the real wages of labor and the interest of legitimate capital? They show eloquently that the small merchant, the small manufacturer, the farmer and all the classes engaged in the real production of wealth are yearly being driven nearer to the verge of economic serfdom by a system which is clearly within their power to correct.

OUR quarrel with Vice President Woll, Vice President of the American Federation of Labor, is of more serious character. He is greatly exercised at Prof. John Dewey's carefully considered study of conditions in Russia, which ran through the columns of the *New Republic*. Mr. Woll calls Prof. Dewey a teacher of Bolshevism. As Prof. Dewey's known sympathies are with labor, as he is one of the Advisory Committee of the Henry George Foundation of America, one of the world's great scholars, as well as one of America's greatest educators, such charge seems little less than ridiculous. Perhaps no one but Mr. Woll would think of Prof. Dewey as a communist. What he

indicated in his *New Republic* articles is the new atmosphere that has been created in Russia as evidenced in its educational systems, the contrast afforded between much that prevailed under Czarist rule, and the determination of the people to work out their own salvation. Prof. Dewey has no sympathy with communism, but views the experiment with toleration that Mr. Matthew Woll might do well to cultivate in his official capacity.

THERE continues to be a chorus of approval for Mr. Hoover's suggestion to relieve unemployment by accumulating a reserve fund for public construction. There is nothing new in the idea—it has been proposed again and again and sometimes acted upon by the states. But this of itself would not be an objection against it. And indeed there is no reason to oppose it. We only wish to indicate that these ever recurring suggestions to transfer a portion of the wealth of the people to the pockets of others as a remedy for what Henry George called the riddle of the Sphinx—the problem of poverty—are futile attempts to answer the question which if not answered once and for all is to be destroyed.

AND of course the suggestion of Mr. Hoover is no answer. It is of a piece—this transfer of wealth from the pockets of one class to the pockets of another—with the clamor for an increase in the tariff as a remedy for depression in certain lines of industry from the very people who have been telling us how wildly and conspicuously prosperous we all are! For this fund to provide a reserve for public works to be used in times of unemployment must come from increased taxation—that is, (and it cannot be repeated too often) must be taken from the pockets of some of the people to be transferred to the pockets of others.

THIS is but another of the efforts to solve the unemployment question by ignoring the necessary passive factor in production—the land. It proceeds, too, on the mistaken assumption of the helplessness of labor as something that needs to be provided for, to be aided by artificially constructive processes. It ignores wholly one pillar of the industrial edifice—Land—forgetting the true relation, seeking to build out of the air a wholly fanciful adjustment between Labor and Government without regard to the main pillar of the edifice. We submit that this is not the way that engineers proceed, and Mr. Hoover has been highly praised for his engineering feats. We submit that not a single bridge, not a single edifice of the simplest sort, could be constructed in this way if the engineer misunderstood the factors and calmly ignored their relation.

THOSE who have read the little pamphlet written by the Editor of LAND AND FREEDOM, "Jones Itemized Rent Bill," have perhaps been amused by the inventory

of those many things that add to the value of land, and the objections that occur to the tenant that he ought not to be called upon to pay for some of these things twice—once to the city and again to the landlord. This aspect of the question is taken quite seriously (as indeed it should be) by the *Washington Post*, which features in a recent issue, museums, art galleries, police protection and traffic provisions as adding to the value of what it calls real estate. Only the *Post* might have indicated that these things add only to the value of that part of real estate which is land or site value.

ONE of the astonishing characteristics of the literary men of this and the preceding generation is the superficiality of their social outlook. It is doubtful if any one of them has made a single contribution to the better understanding of social phenomena. Certainly not Kipling, and just as surely not Wells or Shaw, who in intent at least have set out as adventurers on social discoveries—in both cases a barren quest. We have more to learn from the older generation of literary men, Guizot, in his way Sainte-Beuve (who in his critical dissertations surveyed the whole of life), Matthew Arnold, Ruskin, Macaulay, Dickens, Carlyle, and others. How petty and shallow in comparison seem the modern essayists with their infatuation for the frothy and frivolous, or, at best, the extraneous, the accidental, the panoramic—never the deeplying, fundamental and determining forces that are at work beneath the surface—the deus ex machina back of it all, and which to make no effort to understand is to unloose the fancy for every extravaganza of socialism, futile Utopianism, proletarian or strong-man dictatorships. Anything may be accepted where there is no anchor, no compass, and no sense of direction.

IT is interesting to know that the officers and crew of the notable Expedition to the South Pole, which is now in the Antarctic Region, under the direction of Commander Richard E. Byrd, will have the opportunity, during their long stay in the coldest and most lonely region of the world, to study the writings of Henry George.

To the carefully selected library which was assembled for the expedition, the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation of New York contributed a number of George's books conveyed with an appropriate letter by President Hennessy of the Foundation to Commander Byrd. Writing from Wellington, New Zealand, before his ship set sail for the Far South, Commander Byrd wrote thus:

"Dear Mr. Hennessy,

Thank you for the edition of Henry George's books which will be a valuable addition to our Antarctic library. I am grateful too for your kind expressions wishing the expedition success in the Antarctic."

Mr. Hennessy was prompted in sending the book to Commander Byrd's ships by a timely suggestion made to him by Mr. Morris Van Veen, this city.

A Real Land Victory on Long Island

A REAL estate development company headed by Joseph Frankel and Benjamin Youkum the R.R. man, made application to the Town Board of Oyster Bay and Glen Cove City, L. I., N. Y., to lease public lands of about 650 acres off Ocean Beach Land known as Jones' Beach, and a strip of land 1,000 feet wide and 12,550 feet long across Great South Bay with a provision that the Long Island Railway Co. construct a railroad terminal upon said lands. This lease was to have been for a period of ninety-nine years. The rental to be \$38,500 for the first fourteen years (averaging about \$2,700 per year) after that the rent to be set at ten year periods by a committee appointed by the parties interested.

Adjoining this land are New York State Park lands and the State of New York is now building a causeway from Jones' Beach to connect with the mainland.

The matter came up for a referendum vote before the voters of Oyster Bay Township and Glen Cove City at the last election and was beaten five to one.

The forms of the proposition voted upon were known as Proposition No. 1 and Proposition No.2 which are as follows:

Proposition No. 1:

"Shall Oyster Bay Township and Glen Cove City convey to the Long Island Railroad Company the portion of common lands of said Town and City described in the petition presented by the Long Island Railroad Company, August 8th, 1928, consisting of approximately twenty-four (24) acres on Jones Beach and a strip one hundred (100) feet wide and approximately twelve thousand five hundred fifty (12,550) feet long across South Oyster Bay, upon condition that the Long Island Railroad Company construct a railroad upon said lands and comply with all conditions recited in said petition and resolutions submitting said proposition to vote?"

Proposition No. 2:

"Shall the Town of Oyster Bay and the City of Glen Cove lease to Joseph Frankel the common lands of said Town and City consisting of approximately one (1) square mile situate upon Jones Beach and a strip one thousand (1,000) feet wide and approximately twelve thousand five hundred fifty (12,550) feet long across South Oyster Bay, described in the petition therefor dated August 28, 1928, on file in the Clerk's office of said Town, upon the terms and conditions contained in said petition?"

The excitement caused by the referendum of these two propositions overshadowed the presidential election in the above localities, as one of the newspapers stated. Every club, civic organization, taxpayers association, etc., took part, among them were the Hicksville Chamber of Commerce, Hicksville Civic Association, Business Men's Association of Oyster Bay, Syosset Civic Association, Glenwood Landing Civic Association, Central Park Civic Association, Sea Cliff Civic Association.

Public meetings were held, house to house canvasses were made, walls, fences and trees were placarded with posters, "Save our Beaches." All the local newspapers printed extended accounts of the fight. Even the New York and Brooklyn newspapers became interested and published extended accounts of the affair. The N. Y. *Times* had nearly a column editorial against the lease. The N. Y. *Evening Post*, the *Evening Sun*, the N. Y. *World*, the *Brooklyn Eagle*, etc., gave the referendum election a great many front page notices.

Thousands of hand bills were distributed and the mail carried thousands of letters to the voters by the committee.

A committee of one thousand citizens was organized by Dr. Elwood A. Curtis and Charles Voigt, of Hicksville, to fight the proposed land grab. Dr. Curtis was made chairman. He did most of the work of organizing the opposition to the land grabbing scheme, and was mainly responsible for its defeat. He maintained that Jones Beach is worth \$15,000,000 and belongs to the people and to lease it at a nominal rental for a period of ninety-nine years was against public policy and would mean that the people were parting with the land practically in perpetuity for a grossly inadequate consideration.

The following are slogans from some of the literature circulated by the committee of One Thousand which will give some idea of the nature and extent of the fight made against the land grab:

"Remember the children and save our beaches."

"It is our beach and must be kept for our use and not be permitted to go under the control of the few."

"Do not give up our common lands for the promise of a quick development. We are poor citizens if we allow the things worth most to get in the hands of a few."—Theodore Roosevelt.

Here is a song sung at the public meetings to the tune of "Wait for the Wagon."

Jones' Beach is a garden spot,
Deny it, if they dare,
A few have planned a deep laid plot
To steal it unaware.

CHORUS: The Beach for the People,
The Beach for the People,
The Beach for the People,
Shall be our Battle Cry.

God made the Beach a garden spot,
And made it for all men,
Then why a few connive and plot,
Is far beyond our ken.

Repeat Chorus:

Arouse: Ye men of honest worth,
Allow your souls to leaven,
God gave the land at Nature's birth,
Like "Manna from the Heaven."

During the campaign the town seethed with excitement. The whole question of Human Rights versus Privilege was fought out in this local contest and the people won. We are wondering if some such local storm center may not on some occasion when circumstances are propitious propagate itself through the whole body politic, and the land question become a burning issue. In the meantime, congratulations to the people of Oyster Bay township and Glen Cove.

Frank Stephens on Democracy

THE *Forum* having started a symposium on the question "Is Democracy Breaking Down in America," addressed the inquiry to a number of men prominent as thinkers and publicists in the United States, among whom was Frank Stephens. Mr. Stephens' communication arrived too late for inclusion in the *Forum's* symposium and we are glad to give it space in these columns. Brother Stephens answered the inquiry as follows:

Democracy is not breaking down in the United States. I do not believe it will break down within any time we can foretell. Personally I am more and more impressed as social conditions become worse and worse with the marvellous accuracy with which our democracy functions in giving us an exactly representative government in spite of bitter social injustice among the governed and crass economic ignorance among those who presume to govern.

One can look with philosophic patience even at our National Congress and our State and Municipal law makers when he realizes how their privilege grabbing, their prohibition laws, their hundreds of millions for warships and war preparation, their faith in state police cossacks and sneaking detectives, exactly represent the venality, the hypocrisy, the boastfulness and the cowardice of our people as a whole, from the pow-wow doctors of Old York to the crazy financiers of New York.

That things go as disgracefully wrong with us as a nation is the best possible proof that democracy is working successfully, it is giving us as a nation exactly what we want. But the hope of democracy is the fact that there are more people concerned today in wanting something better than at any other stage of the world's history, and they are more and more coming to realize that the way out is through better understanding of the underlying principles of economics.

I do not believe that the common people have lost faith in democracy in the sense of believing there is some better working theory or practice, that Mussolini is after all a better leader than Mazzini or Thomas Fortune Ryan a better exemplar than Thomas Jefferson.

The people in this country who believe that democracy is breaking down are the class, few in numbers and weak in influence whose opinion my dear friend Dr. Will Durant voices, those in Tennysonian phrase for whom "knowledge comes but wisdom lingers," who having laboriously accumulated huge quantities of undigested and unrelated facts without knowledge of the simple economic truths by which these can be set in order and understood are afflicted with pangs, fears, nightmares and wailing beside which the indigestion of Mr. Polly in Mr. Wells' little tale was as the smiling slumber of infancy.

Let these literati but acquire so much knowledge of the relation of social well-being to social justice and social stability as may be gained by a week's honest study of the economics of Henry George, the realization that simple truths remain true and remain simple even in the most complex civilization, and they will realize that they need have no fear of the breakdown of democracy.

How To Improve the Property Tax

WRITING in the National Tax Association Bulletin, Prof. F. H. Swift of the University of California, says:

"The general property tax is recognized by all students of public taxation as the most unscientific and most unjust type of tax employed in the world today. It was shown, however, that despite its universal condemnation it is the tax most widely used in the United States as a means of providing state school revenues."

Commenting on this, Mr. John Harrington, formerly of the Wisconsin Tax Commission, writes as follows:

"The assertion that the general property tax is unscientific and unjust is either true or it is not true. The question is fundamental. The general property tax now produces two-thirds or more of all state and local taxes. To shift this amount of taxes to other forms of taxation will be a real revolution, and probably a huge mistake.

If assertions are of any value, I am willing to set up the counter-assertion that the general property tax is the most scientific and just tax now in general use in any state.

This is not to say that it is a perfect tax; far from it. But it can be made as nearly a perfect tax as human enactments can be made. The first step toward perfection is to exempt from the tax all ordinary personal property. The next step is to follow the so-called "Pittsburgh Plan," of gradual exemption of buildings and improvements.

This procedure would, of course, result in the greater part of all taxes being imposed on the value of land. And here the so-called "tax experts" will throw up their hands.

They do not seem able to grasp the rather simple proposition that the collector of ground rent makes no return to society for what he receives; that is to say, he is a pensioner on society, giving nothing back, and performing no service in return. This may be illustrated in a striking way by a case in this state where a certain two acre tract of land is worth \$4,000,000, and pays the owner \$200,000 a year net ground rent. Very clearly the \$200,000 is a drain on the income of the community, for which those who receive it give nothing back. The method we have outlined would absorb for taxes a considerable part of this \$200,000 annually. A like result would obtain as to all the lesser ground rent cases.

Actually the whole problem is a sort of underground contest as to whether taxes shall be chiefly borne by labor and productive enterprise and industry, or by the "something for nothing" incomes of monopoly. And I fear

most of the so-called "tax experts" are unconsciously lined up for the latter class in their efforts to reduce the general property tax. Taxes must come out of earned and unearned incomes in greater or lesser proportions. Which shall it be?

Pittsburgh Prepares To Enter-tain Fourth Annual Congress

THE fourth annual Henry George Congress will be held in Pittsburgh, the invitation extended by the Steel City at the Chicago Convention having been accepted. The Pittsburgh Georgeists, realizing that the high standard set by Philadelphia, New York and Chicago, places upon them a heavy responsibility, are already beginning to prepare the way for a great convention, anticipating that the attendance this year will break all previous records.

President Evans of the Henry George Foundation announces the appointment of William N. McNair as Chairman of the Convention Committee. Mr. McNair is President of the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh and has for years been a prominent and active figure in the movement in Pennsylvania, at the last election polling almost a million votes as the Democratic nominee for United States Senator and making the Single Tax a prominent issue in his state-wide speaking campaign.

Heretofore the annual Congress has been held rather early in September, the first year being in session on the actual birthday of Henry George, while at New York and Chicago it was planned to gather as near the birthday date as could conveniently be arranged. This year, however, the Congress is planned as a celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the publication of George's immortal "Progress and Poverty." This anniversary falls on September 25th and the convention dates have therefore been set for September 23d, 24th and 25th.

The William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh's newest and finest, has been selected as the official convention headquarters. It is located in the heart of Pittsburgh's "Golden Triangle," on the newly-widened Grant Street, and is itself one of the many notable examples of the building boom still in progress in Pittsburgh under the influence of its taxation policy which makes it more profitable to improve than to hold valuable land out of use.

LEGISLATIVE CAMPAIGNS IN PENNSYLVANIA AND DELAWARE

Stimulated to special efforts by the official endorsement of the Pennsylvania League of Cities of the Third Class, assembled in convention at New Castle in September, a very active movement is under way in Pennsylvania to secure legislation from the General Assembly that would establish the Pittsburgh graded tax system as the fixed policy of the forty-two third class cities of the state.

While the League is composed of the city officials representing all of these cities and the action was unanimous, surprising even the ardent advocates of the measure, in many of the cities the significance of the graded tax plan is not yet clearly understood and therefore much educational work remains to be done. The officials in a number of the cities, however, are actively working in behalf of the proposed legislation which would, by gradual steps, shift municipal taxes from buildings to land values until the rate on improvements is finally set at just one-half of the land rate.

Among the cities most active in this movement are Lancaster, Erie, Reading, Johnstown, Wilkes-Barre, Harrisburg, Carbondale and Oil City. An attractively illustrated pamphlet, briefly setting forth the advantages of the Pittsburgh plan, has been circulated among the third class cities in the name of the Fair Taxation and Assessment League of Pennsylvania. Henry George Foundation leaders have been active in the movement since its inception. Among the speakers who have recently addressed audiences in Western Pennsylvania cities and towns are George E. Evans, John M. Henry and Percy R. Williams. The biennial session of the Legislature opened in January.

Under the leadership of Frank T. Stirlith, of Wilmington, another aggressive campaign has been launched in Delaware. It will be recalled that two years ago the Delaware Senate passed without a dissenting vote a bill authorizing the City of Wilmington to adopt a graded tax plan modeled after the Pittsburgh system, and strong support was assured also in the lower House, where the bill did not reach a vote. This time it is reported that more influential support is being enlisted and some of Wilmington's leading civic and commercial bodies are giving the matter very favorable attention.

PITTSBURGH CLUB ENJOYS ACTIVE SEASON

The Henry George Club of Pittsburgh entered recently upon its fifth year of regular weekly luncheon meetings and is maintaining the same lively interest that has characterized its previous seasons. To afford variety, the club covers a wide range of topics, but under the leadership of President McNair the policy has been to schedule Single Tax talks as often as speakers are available to deal interestingly with the various phases of the Henry George philosophy and its practical application.

Among the speakers this season who have discussed Single Tax philosophy or activities were G. Frank Kelly, of Scottsdale, George Edwards, of Youngstown, Ohio, M. S. Robinson, Carl D. Smith, William N. McNair and Percy R. Williams, of Pittsburgh. Some prominent Single Tax visitors from other cities are expected to address the club during the year.

Agricultural Distress, Its Cause and Remedy

ACCORDING to the 1920 United States census the value of farm lands and buildings in the State of New York was \$1,425,061,470.00.

At that time the assessed valuation of the land alone of New York City was over \$5,000,000,000.00. At 5% net the land values of the Metropolis would yield an income three and one half times greater than the investment in farm lands and buildings combined. Allowing one half of the census estimate for the value of buildings and one half for the value of the land (a generous concession to land value, considering the number of farms sold for less than cost of improvements) the income from New York City lands would exceed the income from agricultural lands seven to one. If we then take into account the value of the lands within the boundaries of the other large cities and towns of the State, and the natural value of mines, water powers and quarries it is clear that farm land values are a very small percentage of the State's total land values.

This condition prevails in greater or less degree in every State and community throughout the Union. Everywhere agricultural land is low in value. Everywhere city and town lands and natural resources, which admit of monopoly, are high in value.

May not inequitable economic conditions generated by this wide divergence in land values be the chief cause of agricultural distress? May not an examination of these conditions show clearly what is the matter with farming?

The farmer, on his cheap land, must toil long and wearing days, year in and year out, to earn a living and pay his taxes, and all too often the effort and the farm are abandoned. But the income in ground rents and royalties from the valuable lands is so large that their owners can, and do, live luxuriously without labor. Of the vast wealth produced through the agency of modern inventions and and scientific and industrial improvements agriculture receives a constantly diminishing share while the coffers of the owners of valuable lands and natural opportunities are overflowing. For them is the threshed wheat, for the farmer the stack of straw.

The farmer is a land user. Farm buildings, improvements, continued fertility and all farm products are the result of his labor—the forces of his mind and body—applied productively to land; and in buying and selling, in exchanging the products of the farm for the products of other industries, he uses city and town lands.

The owner of valuable land may use it himself, or permit others to use it on payment of a fixed share of production, usually reckoned in money, called rent; may speculate in it, or let it lie idle in expectation of profiting from a rise in value. In any case ownership without use produces nothing. Use alone produces all the great variety of

material things known to men as wealth; the food, clothing and shelter necessary to sustain life; the luxuries; the tools, machinery, buildings and materials used in production; the schools, universities, churches, theatres and playgrounds which promote our physical, mental and spiritual development. Every material thing, in fact, except the Earth and its resources, the handiwork of the Creator of the Universe.

Likewise use, not ownership, creates the *value* of the natural element. Where dense population and industrial activity cause an intensive use of land, as in large cities and towns, land values and rents are high. Where population is sparse and industry limited, as in farming sections, land values and rents are low. The value of a whole county of farms, improvements included, is often less than that of a small lot in the business centre of a large city. Thus the plot of ground in the City of Chicago, on which stands the Marshall Field store, is assessed at \$12,000,000.00, exceeding in value 1,000 average western farms, buildings included (1920 census.)

While the production of wealth is by land users only (farmers, miners, manufacturers, merchants) the division is between land owners on the one hand and land users on the other. To the former as rent paid for the use of land, to the latter as wages for their labor, and interest on investments in buildings, machinery and improvements in and on the land. The share that goes to the *users* of land is that part of production which is left after rent is taken out.

The injustice of this division is evident when we consider what has preceded, that ownership of land produces nothing and *use* everything.

The farmer complains bitterly and justly of the heavy burden of taxation heaped upon his shoulders, but does not seem to realize that the high rentals exacted from industry for the use of valuable lands is a far heavier burden, which, if not removed, will reduce him to the condition of tenant or peasant. High rents for land drain the farm of its wealth indirectly, but none the less surely, through the processes of exchange, depressing the price of everything he sells and enhancing the price of everything he buys. Whether he sells or buys he pays city ground rents and city taxes to city landlords.

When the products of the farm are marketed transportation and selling charges are deducted from the sales price. Included in these charges are wages of managers and employees, interest on money invested in buildings, transportation and selling facilities, ground rents paid for the use of land, and taxes. When the farmer buys in town ground rents and taxes are included in the price of the article he buys. A merchant or manufacturer paying a heavy ground rental and taxes must charge these "overheads" in the selling price or go out of business. Transporters, manufacturers and merchants are entitled, equally with the farmer, to a return for the services they render the

community in production and distribution, and often they secure as little. But ground rents take toll without service in return, from the producer and consumer alike. The "Middlemen" who rob the farmer constantly the year round are not his companions in industry but the *unproductive* landlords. Farmers are caught, as it were, both coming and going. Taxed directly on their buildings, improvements and personal property they also pay and cannot escape, under present conditions, city ground rents and city taxes in the low returns received for their produce and the high prices paid for farm and household needs.

Furthermore, since the use of land by industry is the sole means of producing the necessities and comforts of existence, the control of lands containing the raw materials which industry must have in order to produce carries with it the power to take from the users of land in the form of rent a large share of their product. Vast monopolies in possession of the natural resources of the Earth aided by unfair tariff and franchise privileges, through extensive organization and combinations, restrict production, stifle competition and control markets and prices. With the Steel Trust controlling the iron ore output of the nation, with large areas of anthracite coal lands held out of use and assessed at ridiculously low figures, with forests, quarries, water and electrical powers in the hands of great corporations is it surprising that farmers pay exorbitant prices for coal, farm machinery, tools, and farm and household necessities?

How different is the lot of the tiller of the soil! By reason of the wide extent and cheapness of the lands they cultivate and their comparative isolation farmers are unable to effectually organize to form monopolies of their products and control prices or to benefit materially from special legislation in their behalf. They are in a situation which forces them to compete with one another and all other land users for the little that is left after taxes are paid, landlords have collected their rents and the monopolies controlling valuable natural resources have "cut their melons" and declared their dividends.

The solution of the agricultural problem, the straight road to farm relief, lies in the abolition of these conditions, in the release of industry from servitude and monopolies.

The problem may be formulated in the query, shall land (all natural resources) be used productively, as farmers, miners, manufacturers and distributors use it, the rewards of use remaining with the user, or, shall it be misused to rob the producer and the community as speculators and monopolies selfishly misuse it?

The question carries its own answer. The producer is entitled to all the rewards of use undiminished by taxes or the exactions of monopolies, and the community to the rent of the land. In place of taxes government should collect for public uses the rent of land created by the growth and activities of the community and justly its source of revenue.

If I were to neglect to pick the apples on my own trees and were caught robbing my neighbor's orchard I should be at once arrested. Yet each time the State collects taxes from the individual it does that very thing. It neglects the apples of rent growing in the people's orchard, and entering private grounds, robs the producer of the fruits of his toil.

That distinguished American economist and lover of mankind, Henry George, in his epoch making book, "Progress and Poverty," was the first to point out this fundamental error in government, the injustice of taxing individual effort, and the injury that speculation and monopoly in natural resources inflict on the users of land. Since his time many communities and municipalities in many different countries have enacted legislation decreasing taxes on buildings and improvements and taking a greater share of rent for public purposes. Notably in Denmark, where farmers' organizations are enthusiastically in favor of, and have secured the enactment of laws favoring this reform. Farmers in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Brazil, Argentina, and in our own country, in North Dakota and California have worked for and secured building and improvement tax exemption.

What are the benefits to agriculture which have induced these farmers in so many different lands to look with favor upon the tax on rent, named by Henry George, "The Single Tax?" In the first place, all the multifarious taxes on farm buildings, improvements, machinery, livestock and personal property, and on the exchange of products would be abolished. Toward the support of government the farmer would make annual payments based on the rental value of his land. Since the rental value of land is low in farming communities and since buildings, improvements, and the exchange of products would pay no tax his contribution toward government would be light. The burden of taxation would be lifted from his shoulders. The main support of government would fall upon the valuable lands of the cities and towns, and natural monopolies. The farmer could improve and stock his farm to its fullest capacity unmolested by the tax assessor, and since rental value is purely a location or site value, the improved, highly cultivated farm would pay no more tax than land in the same neighborhood grown up in weeds and brush. Possession and ownership would be more secure than under present conditions, so burdensome and unprofitable, that farms without number are sold for non-payment of taxes, or abandoned.

Agricultural communities by their industry and the trade they bring to town and city help to create the enormous land values in the central locations. If we may believe the many fine things said of the farm, that it is the backbone of the nation, that its youth replenish the cities, that if farm operations ceased for but a few days the cities would starve, then it is entitled to its reward, and what reward more equitable than that farmers should share in

the values they help to create? Good roads, light and power could be extended to remote communities, and more and better schools, universities, hospitals and pleasure grounds could be made free to all.

When government in place of taxing industry shall collect its revenue from the rent of lands all land owners will be placed on an equality. Owners of valuable lands will have no advantage over owners of cheap lands. They will then, like the farmer, find their profit in *use*, not from the special privilege of collecting the ground rents belonging to the people. Speculative value and speculative rent will be destroyed but economic value for use will remain, and men will hold land not in hope of speculative enrichment but for its utility value. The full use of city lands and natural privileges thus brought about, encouraged by the exemption from taxation of improvements, buildings and products, will fully employ capital and labor, creating a profitable, extensive, and permanent market for farm products.

Natural law gives to the toiler the full wages of his toil. To the fisherman the fish, to the hunter the game, to the farmer the fruits and grains, to industry its sure and just reward, and to communities the rent of land, the "unearned increment" due to the growth and activities of population. The holding of land out of use by speculation and monopoly violates natural law. It denies users access to the source of employment and robs them of their natural wage. It creates an unnatural scarcity and high price of land and the raw materials drawn from land. It causes rent to rise to speculative heights, and since the division of wealth is between land owners and land users, gain to land owners in speculative rents is loss to land users in wages and interest. That the recognition of natural law in our legislation would benefit agriculture immensely cannot be doubted. Is not the farmer's wage the price he receives for his produce and what are the improvements he has placed in and upon his land but the wages of toil? Wages, as here defined, make up the income of the great majority of farmers, rent contributes practically nothing. Only when natural conditions of production and exchange lower the rent of land and raise the wages of labor will the farmer come into his own and attain that "equality in industry" so much talked about and so little understood.

Such natural conditions and such equality were enjoyed by Agriculture in the early days of the Republic. The untouched natural resources of a great continent invited labor to full employment and full reward. Unemployment for willing workers was unknown. Rents and taxes were low, and although the production of wealth per capita was small, agriculture, the principal industry, was prosperous and received its just and equitable share. As settlement progressed, the growth of population and demand for land caused an increase in value, particularly in land located in towns and cities and in mining and other natural privileges.

Opportunities for speculation and monopoly multiplied as the nation grew until today unnaturally high speculative rents and excessive taxes rob land users of the larger share of their production, with agriculture, deluded by politicians and monopolistic propaganda, suffering the most keenly of any industry.

I ask my fellow farmers, and all interested in farm relief, to carefully consider the causes and remedy of farm distress, as here set forth.

—C. H. BAILDON.

Ownership of The Ether Lanes

PRIVATE ownership of land, which, being interpreted, is the right to monopolize more land than one needs for the purpose of increasing the needs of others, has by the lapse of time and the right of might become so deeply imbedded in the minds of the land owners that neither the suffering of the poor, nor the follies, nor the crimes of the excessive rich seems to arouse them to a realization of the iniquity of their doctrine. In our day the Herzian wave has opened a vast new domain rich in opportunities. It will require the utmost diligence of every just man, woman, and child in the world to prevent the callous monopolist from obtaining so-called vested rights in the ether lanes.

In comparison with the civilized nations of Europe, the laws of the United States are especially lacking in protecting the public in its rights to the use of the ether lanes.

Much credit, however, must be given to Senator C. C. Dill and his committeemen for the act for the regulation of radio communications and the amendment thereto passed by Congress. Section I thereof provides for the regulation of all forms of interstate and foreign transmissions and communications; to maintain the control of the United States over all the channels of interstate and foreign radio transmission; and to provide for the use of such channels but not the ownership thereof, by individuals, firms, or corporations, for limited periods of time, under licenses granted by Federal authority, and no such licenses shall be construed to create any right beyond the terms, conditions, and periods of the license.

However, the student of the history of taxation will tell you that this statute is lacking in one very important particular, because it takes property without compensation. The value of the ether lanes belongs to the public and the chief duty of the government is to collect this value for the purpose of defraying the expenses of government and public improvements. It, therefore, follows that the rental value of the ether lanes should be sold at public auction to the highest bidder annually with the provision that if there are not enough lanes to go around the time of occupancy should be divided in such a way as to produce the greatest revenue for the State. The writer has a letter from Senator Dill in which he expressed the hope that he and his fellow committeemen can arrange to have the law amended to that effect.

It remains then for the good people of the United States to up-hold the hands of the Honorable C. C. Dill, Senator from Washington, and the other members of the Committee of Interstate Commerce who have this matter in charge, and communicate with their Congressmen and urge them to follow the lead of Senator Dill in this respect. It would seem that a very simple amendment to the bill might be enacted as follows:

A BILL

To amend an Act entitled "An Act for the regulation of radio communications," approved February 23, 1927, and for other purposes.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That the Act entitled "An Act for the regulation of radio communications," approved February 23, 1927, and for other purposes, be amended by adding at the end of section 4, subsection C a new section to be known as subsection C1.

That on the first day of July, or in the event that the first day of July falls on Sunday or a legal holiday, then on the next succeeding day, in each and every year, all persons, firms, or corporations which shall desire to transmit communications by radio shall apply to the Commission in writing for written specifications of the band frequencies or wave lengths, and other details, rules, and regulations upon which licenses may be granted, said applications to be prepared upon printed forms to be furnished by the Commission, and to contain such details concerning the application for the purposes and mechanical equipment, list of transmission desired, and other details as the Commission may require, which said applications shall be filed by the Commission in the order received, and within thirty days from the first day of August said applicant shall be entitled to receive a form of sealed bid to be prepared by the Commission setting forth the various band or frequency wave lengths, times of operation, imitations of power of stations using the same, and other details, so that the applicant may insert opposite each band frequency or wave length offered by the Commission the sum or amount which the applicant will pay for the use thereof for the time or times to be specified, which bid shall be sealed and signed, not by any name, but by a number, for identification, which identification numbers shall be enclosed in a separate envelope, both envelopes being prepared and furnished by the Commission, and the envelope containing the identification number to be also sealed, and the Commission shall in not less than sixty and not more than ninety days from the first of August in each and every year open the sealed bids and assign the wave lengths to the highest bidder who shall have conformed to the rules and regulations in making his bid, and who shall have deposited with such sealed bid earnest money amounting to 10% of his bid, so as to secure for

the use of the government the greatest amount of compensation possible.

Any person, firm, or corporation who shall make more than one sealed bid, or in any way attempt to defraud the government of any part of the revenue sought to be obtained by this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be, upon conviction thereof, subjected to a fine of not less than one thousand dollars, and imprisonment of not less than one year, or both, according to the discretion of the Court, and shall be debarred by the Commission from transmission by radio for such period as the Commission shall seem just and right. All bids which are refused shall be returned at once by the Commission with their checks for earnest money.

CHARLES G. BALDWIN.

Warren Worth Bailey

DEMOCRATIC JOURNALIST

Note: This was written after a conversation on December 12th, 1928, with one of Mr. Bailey's old Chicago friends, John Z. White.

SYNONYMOUS with the term "Democratic Journalism" is the name of a great disciple of Henry George who has recently passed away, Warren Worth Bailey, of Johnstown, Pennsylvania. It is significant that the Single Tax cause has lost, in the past year, two of its greatest teachers—Louis Freeland Post and Warren Worth Bailey. Like Henry George himself, these two men had smeared their shirt sleeves with printer's ink early in life, and never wholly got away from it. As young men they sought the laws that should guarantee human rights. Henry George found these laws in the raw, so to speak, and listed his "findings in "Progress and Poverty." It was somewhat by accident that both Mr. Post and Mr. Bailey ran across these findings which contained the solution to the problems that had puzzled their minds. Most of us are familiar with the story of how Mr. Post, as an editorial writer, was told to read "a book called Progress and Poverty" if he wanted "to have enough ideas to last him a life-time."

It is to John Z. White we are indebted for a tale of the incidents which led up to Mr. Bailey's great discovery. Mr. Bailey and his brother were publishing a country paper in Vincennes, Indiana, to which books were frequently sent to be reviewed. Each book as it came in was introduced to the desk drawer. One rainy day it was decided to clean house. In sorting out odds and ends of papers and books, Mr. Bailey ran into one book that had come in some months before. He opened it, read the first lines, and adjourned the house-cleaning for *that* afternoon. He tipped back on his chair and continued to read far, far into the night.

Mr. Bailey had been discussing economics with a friend and both had become ardent free traders. But it worried them that free trade had not produced results that they had

been taught to look for in England. For the lack of a better explanation they condemned the "miserable aristocracy." But as to how the miserable aristocracy were at fault the two men were at a loss to explain. It was now that Mr. Bailey saw his friend and asked him a lot of questions. "What have you been reading? You've got something!" was the reply. So the friend read "Progress and Poverty" and they now both understood why free trade didn't produce the expected results in England.

It was the next few issues of the *Vincennes News* that saw an increasingly large amount of editorial space devoted to explaining the philosophy of Henry George. With the increase in Single Tax editorials came a corresponding decrease in advertising, so the *News* was sold out and Mr. Bailey came to Chicago. He had come to Vincennes in 1879, the year that "Progress and Poverty" was published, and it was now nine years later, 1888.

As a Chicagoan Warren Worth Bailey was connected with several dailies, most particularly with the *Chicago Daily News* as editorial writer. He wrote clear and compact English. He was concise. Few newspapers men were his equal. His greatest force was his sincerity, but he was as persistent as gravity. He crowded Henry George doctrine into his editorials until he was given orders to quit. Then he put it in different form by historical allusion, with references to "Piers Plowman" and the English enclosure system. He gained the reputation of being able to say the "same thing in more ways than any other man." You could no more drive him from the trail than you could a well bred and well trained blood hound. But the *Chicago Daily News* did not wish to suffer the same fate as the *Vincennes News*! After five years' writing in Chicago a city was sought out where he could publish a daily paper of his own, and on which all that an editorial needed was the signature of "W. W." In 1893 the Bailey brothers purchased the *Johnstown Democrat* of Johnstown, Pennsylvania. In each issue that followed for thirty-five years there was always some space devoted to democratic ideals. Here, as in every part of his career, Warren Worth Bailey hewed true to the line.

He went on the principle that you can sell goods much better with a pleasant voice and a pleasant manner. He was a persistent proponent without being obstreperous. For nearly the whole time that he was in Chicago he was president of the newly organized Chicago Single Tax Club. He got prominent people to advocate opposition, and regularly visited the hotels to find some well known person from out of the city who would like to recite his experiences. As frequently as not these people came in a somewhat hostile mood and went away thorough-going Single Taxers. Mr. Bailey was instrumental in pushing other people to the front.

During his two terms in Congress (1912 and 1914) he worked continually among its members. He constantly pressed the educational work and believed in taking advan-

tage of political opportunities as they offered themselves. Yet at no time would he sacrifice his convictions to catch the popular vote. Each time, he was elected from an overwhelming protection district although he was known by his editorials as a free trader. His anti-prohibition attitude is said to have caused his defeat in the several campaigns since the first Wilson administration. As a Congressman Mr. Bailey delivered an address on the Single Tax which was printed in the *Congressional Record*, and later widely distributed through the mails. His first impulse was opposed to war in any and all directions. He saw war to be a time when the government gets into a state of confusion and when human rights are invaded. He was by no means a friend of the sedition statute.

While no one appreciated humor more than Mr. Bailey he was not himself a story teller. Yet there was nothing melancholy in his character; he was a healthy, vigorous, square-toed, practical man. He was a fearless advocate of an unpopular cause. If we had more like Warren Worth Bailey—a truly democratic journalist—it would not be long until we had a generation that knew something about democracy.

—JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE.

Poking Fun at the Tariff

AT last a complete and logical tariff is in sight. Keep out everything not grown according to American standards of growing. The farmer is to be protected "from his foreign low-cost producer competitor;" but, as the American Farm Bureaucrat assures us, the increased rates "will not necessarily increase the price over the retail counter." The farmer will be stirred to efficiency and the competitive spirit. Apparently, he is looking for protection, not profit. Indeed, the case is perfectly simple, and only free trade malignants pretend to misunderstand it.

Suppose the farmer does unnecessarily, if inevitably, get more for his stuff. It is one of the known miracles of protection that though the producers' price be higher, the consumer doesn't pay any more. Besides, it seems that "kitchen costs" are rather negligible. This great truth is as yet imperfectly appreciated, at least in these diggings. Time and the perfect tariff yet to be made will instruct the ignorant and soothe the kickers. The farm protectionists base their rates on the theory that industry already has the protection to which it is entitled. So the Master of the National Grange says, with perhaps too severe irony. If the Ways and Means Committee is of another mind and industrial rates are to be hoisted, then the farmers will ask a corresponding lift, raise for raise.

So the tariff of tariffs, completely finished and rounded in itself, begins to poke its commanding and predatory nose above the horizon.

—N. Y. Times.

A Latter-Day David

(Editorial, *Boston Globe*)

HALF a century ago this very Autumn a slim man of 38 sat before a table in a bare little room in a house in San Francisco writing. On the face of this shabbily dressed man there was, however, no indication that want had disabled his spirit. One would never guess that here was a sturdy soul who had been struggling 19 years with adversity, discouragement and hunger; whose account stood, at the moment, exactly \$450 on the debit side; who scarcely knew from one week to another whence tomorrow's meal would come.

His lips smiled. From deep blue eyes gleamed a vision, which he was transmitting to words on the cheap writing paper before him. He had begun a magazine article to win bread; but he had discovered something greater clamoring within him, a book. And, though he little dreamed it then, this book was to shake America out of her lethargy of indifference to economic and social thought, to set Ireland and Scotland afire, to summon George Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells forth on their respective careers, to produce amazing repercussions in England, to initiate a reform movement in Germany, stir France, travel overseas to Australia, New Zealand, China and Japan, and awaken response even from Africa.

For this brave little David was loading a sling to hurl at the oldest foe of human happiness the world over, the gaunt specter that stalked by his own hearthside: Hunger. His name was Henry George. The book was "Progress and Poverty."

A MAN AND AN IDEA

There are two major themes entwined in the story of Henry George. Actually, they march as one to the music of a single idea. If his life was of itself one of the inspiring chapters in modern biography, that was because it was fired by loyalty to a high ideal which came to focus in an idea of society which "Progress and Poverty" sets forth. Few men achieve such dynamic unity. Fewer, having achieved it, maintain it as he did. Seldom have heroes faced greater odds with a sweeter nature or a more valorous one. And few have poured light into dark places of human misery with a more powerful eloquence and a richer observation of human life itself.

One of a family of 10, he began life in very humble circumstances in Philadelphia in 1839. At 13 he was done with school forever, and working for \$2 a week to aid his family. Yet his love of learning was already awake, never afterward to slumber. And so was his will power—which was one of the remarkable factors in his career. At 18 he had voyaged across the world to India before the mast, had learned the printing trade, and was working passage around South America, bound for the gold fields of California.

There his hopes were disappointed, and the long struggle with poverty began in earnest. Prospector, storekeeper,

typesetter, weigher in a rice mill, farmer, printer, peddler of clothes wringers, newspaperman, editor, lecturer, odd-job man, dogged by endless economic upsets over which he had no control, he still kept his courage firm and began at last to make himself felt in Pacific Coast journalism.

As he observed life and tasted its harsh fare, he thought about it. His thought first brought him into collision with the great railroad monopoly in California, then gathering in millions of acres of public lands. Failing to purchase him, they set out to crush him by obtaining control of the paper employing him. He founded one of his own.

THE CAREER BEGINS

Widespread unemployment and recurring business depressions stirred Henry George's mind profoundly and he perceived that both were related to the diminishing of free land and the growth of land monopoly in the hands of the few. The seed of "Progress and Poverty" sprouted. In 1879 it came to harvest in the book. But the book was rejected by all the established publishing houses; Henry George was compelled to set type for it himself.

The book made slow progress. America, till then, had been preoccupied with political thinking to the exclusion of economics and social problems. That national habit of thought had been deepened and intensified by the Civil War and its aftermath. So, although "Progress and Poverty" obtained some good reviews here and there, it lagged. Only an explosion of great proportions could attract attention. The explosion came.

Copies of "Progress and Poverty" had traveled overseas. Ireland was engaged in the mighty struggle led by the Land League against landlordism, and to this cause the book came as a stirring contribution. It ran riot in Ireland and its author was invited to come and talk to Land League audiences. Next thing America knew, it was startled one morning to read in the papers that an American writer, Henry George, had been arrested by the British Government because of his book and his lectures, both of which laid down the precept that the land belongs to the people and that monopoly of land is the major cause of poverty among the dispossessed masses.

WORLD FAME

The affair blew up a storm of international proportions. The *Times* devoted a whole page to a review of the book. Liberals and Irish members of Commons demanded the unconditional release of Henry George and the curbing of the unwarranted police activities of the Government.

The author returned to New York famous—and almost as poor as when he left it. For now came one of the proofs of his disinterested idealism; he ignored the possibilities of profit from his book. The income went to the issue of cheaper editions of "Progress and Poverty".

The remainder of his life was devoted to propagation of his gospel. Five times he visited Great Britain. He

ran for Mayor of New York to further the reform so dear to his heart, the defeat of poverty; and flabbergasted machine politicians gaped when the returns showed him supported by 68,000 votes. "What will you do now?" he was asked after his defeat. "I will buy a box of pens and a bottle of ink and go back to writing."

He did. The *Standard* was founded to push the anti-poverty campaign and become one of the most brilliant papers in America. "Progress and Poverty" became more nearly a universal topic than any other book of its time.

ONE OF STANDARD TREATISES

The essence of "Progress and Poverty" is the contention that wealth is the product of human labor, but that land is the creation of God; so that if wealth belongs to its makers, the land, whence man draws the means of labor, belongs to the community. Land value is not due to any act of its owner, but to increasing population pressure. In other words, its value is given it by the community itself. Monopoly of land appropriates this "unearned increment of value" and at the same time deprives the common man of his opportunity to become independent as his forefathers were. They had plenty of free land; he has little or none. And so, while population increases, and monopoly grows, poverty increases and labor finds itself in more and more helpless a position. Henry George's solution was to abolish all taxes save a tax on land, which, in his reasoning, would produce equality of opportunity. Whether one agrees or not with his argument, "Progress and Poverty" is one of those rare books which are found on the shelves of every one who cares for brave encounter with a fundamental problem of human society.

A Lesson From Henry George

(Editorial Toledo (Ohio) Sunday *Times*)

A STRAY newspaper clipping going the rounds of the press has brought to our editorial consciousness a flood of recollections, to which the substance of the clipping has added a moral for these times.

It is now more than 30 years since a certain day when, as we sat at our desk grinding out "copy" for an impatient composition room foreman, who for half an hour had been whistling down the tube to our excruciating agony, the door of our dimly lighted sanctum opened, and on the threshold stood a stranger.

"My name is George," he said, advancing slightly, as we looked up.

There was something in that stranger's face that riveted instant attention—something in the voice and attitude that inspired instant interest. The thought of Henry George, father of the Single Tax and author of "Progress and Poverty," then just in the making of world-wide fame,

was as far from our mind as the nebular hypothesis. We had never seen a portrait of Henry George, and there had been no intimation of his being within a thousand miles of the scene of our daily labors.

Yet that face—particularly that Shakespearean brow and those calm, earnest eyes—persisted in prompting our surprised intelligence with what seemed only the widest guess.

"My name is George," had been his sole introduction.

"Not 'Progress and Poverty'" we ventured desperately.

He smiled assentingly.

"Yes, 'Progress and Poverty'" he replied "I am Henry George."

There followed much felicitation, as convincing as we could make it, upon his "advent to our midst," and a conversation never to be forgotten and destined to be recalled in future years by many communications between us, although we never met again.

Within a year Mayor Tom L. Johnson of Cleveland had absorbed and become the special champion of the Single Tax theory, and Ohio rang with its reverberations in politics. The world greeted "Progress and Poverty" as an epoch-making book, England evincing as much interest in it as America, and translators of a dozen tongues were busy over its pages.

But now we come upon a very different manifestation of its author's genius—a love letter written to his wife on the twenty-third anniversary of their first meeting. They were at the time an obscure couple, as fame goes, and the struggle with family cares bore heavily on the shoulders of Henry George.

No separation had occurred, to occasion this letter, now brought to us in the newspaper clipping referred to.

Mr. and Mrs. George were at home. She had retired and he had been working at his desk late into the night. But he had not forgotten it was the anniversary of their first meeting 23 years before, and he penned this missive, to be discovered by Mrs. George in the morning.

"It is 23 years ago tonight," he wrote, "since we first met—I only a month or two older than Harry and you not much older than our Jen. For 23 years we have been closer to each other than to anyone else in the world, and I think we esteem each other more and love each other better than when we first began to love. You are now 'fat, fair and forty,' and to me the mature woman is more handsome and more lovable than the slip of a girl whom 23 years ago I met without knowing that my life was to be bound up with hers.

"We are not rich; so poor just now, in fact, that all I can give you on this anniversary is a little love letter; but there is no one we can afford to envy, and in each other's love we have what no wealth could compensate for. And so let us go on, true and loving, trusting in Him to carry us further who has brought us so far with so little regret. For 23 years you have been mine, and I have been

yours, and though 23 years your husband, I am more than ever your lover."

This picture of domestic felicity, of devoted loyalty between husband and wife, after nearly a quarter of a century, of a home undismayed by considerations of adversity, but having an outlook of happiness on account of conjugal love alone, is a picture which we may well pause to contemplate in these times, when the domestic fireside has been reduced almost to a memory and the obligations of marriage and parenthood sit altogether too lightly upon the shoulders of the wedded.

Jersey's Tax Injustice

(Editorial, *Camden Evening Courier*).

YOU keep your house ship-shape. You paint it often and never let the repairs get beyond you. You see that the lawn and shrubbery is trimmed.

The house next door is exactly the same kind of house. But it is dirty, unpainted and badly in need of repair. The grass is a foot high and there is no shrubbery at all.

You own the home you live in.

The owner of the place next door is holding it for "investment."

Yet you pay the higher taxes. And the more you improve your place, inside or out, the more taxes you will have to pay.

In short, the owner is penalized for being a good citizen, for taking pride in his home and in his community.

* * * *

Suppose one of Camden's industries needs new machinery to bring its plant up to date.

If it gets that machinery the taxes will jump. Every improvement it makes to its factory, every effort it exerts to better conditions for its workers will send the tax bill that much higher.

Thus the manufacturer too, is penalized for helping industry, his community and his State.

* * * *

Now consider the South Jersey farmer.

He would like to improve his equipment. Some of it is old and out-of-date. He would put in a couple of tractors. He would modernize his dairy.

Yet every such step would bring the farmer a fat rise in taxes. The less efficient his farm, the lower his taxes. The more antiquated his methods, the less he will have to dump into the State coffers. The less he serves his fellowman, the cheaper it will be for him.

Thus the farmer, too, must pay dear for being a progressive citizen.

* * * *

There are two important factors in this miscarriage of taxation in New Jersey.

One is the purely personal taxes—taxes on household goods, machinery, farm implements—and in fact, all the

tools of industry. Not only are these personal taxes unfair in themselves but they are levied unfairly.

The other large factor in New Jersey taxation is the relative assessments on improved and unimproved land.

Here again a penalty is provided for the man with pride in his community.

Recently we published on this page an article on "Site-value Taxation" by Alfred N. Chandler, chairman of Industrial Tax Relief, Inc.

This organization would make land itself, rather than improvements, the principal basis for tax assessment. It would tax the man who lets land lay idle for his full share of the burden, instead of putting it all on those with improved property.

We will not rehearse the thoughts in Mr. Chandler's article here. His scheme appears to have real merit. It is logical and it is workable.

There is at present a Tangible Personal Property Tax Commission in New Jersey. That commission has just called a series of hearings on proposals to abandon personal and industrial taxes. Here is a step in the right direction.

But why not give our tax laws a thorough overhauling, just as we did our traffic laws? Why not consider the "Site-value" method as well as the abandonment of the iniquitous personal and industrial levies?

Farmers Turning To Us

(Editorial *Rural New Yorker*, Jan. 26, 1929).

OUR correspondence indicates that many farmers have come to adopt economic rent as a basis of taxation. They seem for the most part to have worked this out in their own way, without identifying it with the old "Single Tax" ideas taught by the old economists. The principle of economic rent is that rent is the amount (or value) of products received from land above the cost of production. When land is so poor that it produces only enough to pay the cost of culture, there is no rent. Of course this applies to land used for residential and business purposes as well as to cultivated areas. Under a system of taxing rent values, there is no tax on improvements. To suddenly adopt the rent value as a basis of taxation would work an unfair hardship on people who have invested their savings in land values under the present system as a protection for old age or for dependents. But this difficulty could be overcome by taking, say 5 per cent. off the assessments of improvements and adding it to land values for 20 years, when the improvements would be taxless. Farmers as a whole have been shy of the so-called "Single Tax" plan because it looked like an extra burden for their larger acreage, but by their own process of reasoning they are now coming practically to the same thing in demanding that all taxes be collected on net income. While not fully the same thing, it is nearly the same in principle. There would be no tax except when there is a profit from the use

of land alone, and these farmers begin to see that the enormous rental values of city lands now going to a few individuals would pay the taxes of the nation.

What Ails the Theatre? High Land Prices and High Rents

JAMES R. BROWN, PRESIDENT MANHATTAN
SINGLE TAX CLUB

(Special article in *New York Sunday World*, Jan. 6.)

HARD times have struck the theatrical business. Carking care grips the managers.

How to increase receipts and keep down expenses is the all-absorbing thought.

The troubles of the theatre are not the troubles of the theatre only but of all industry—high overhead and diminishing receipts. This condition is not an accident, but like all effects it has a cause, and the only remedy is the removal of the cause.

The problem is not solved by merely reducing here and there salaries, for the trouble is not fundamentally due to high salaries. Lower compensation to players is not by any means an unmixed blessing.

The trouble of the theatre lies deeper than the salary question and is fourfold in manifestation, but due to one common cause—a very clumsy and unjust system of taxation that produces dear land, dear building material and imposes heavy taxes on building and equipment, and the high rents theatre-goers are compelled to pay, seriously limiting their ticket purchasing ability.

WHY IS LAND SO DEAR ?

First, the outrageously high cost of land constitutes a serious part of the burden carried by this industry. Why is land so dear? No matter where you are, to buy enough land to bury a snake, it costs a King's ransom. Land costs nothing to produce; the legend says it was made by the Creator and given to the race free of charge. There are a lot of us busy trying with great success to correct that oversight.

The selling price of everything but land is determined by the cost of production. The scientific truth is that the selling price of land has a different genesis and nature than the selling price of things made by man.

The selling price of land is the amount of economic rent or annual social service value that we fail to collect by taxation, capitalized.

By social service we mean streets, roads, schools, police, fire department, etc., and the advantages growing out of an ever increasing population.

The better the social service and the greater the pressure of population, the higher will be the annual social value, and the greater the amount of this socially created value

we fail to collect by taxation, the greater will be the selling price of land.

To keep land reasonably cheap so that industry can buy and use it without being crushed, we must collect more of economic rent. This and this alone will keep the selling price of land down to a reasonable usable level.

CORRECT VIEW OF TAXATION

Second—The cost of building material is greatly augmented by taxes that fall upon industry in all directions and must be added to the selling price of all products. Hence the cost of building theatres is artificially high because of a foolish tax system.

Third—Not the least by any means of the burdens carried by the theatre is the tax levied upon building and equipment, a tax without justification in science, ethics or business.

To get a correct concept of what taxation really is and how it should be administered is the first step toward salvation. Now taxation is a payment to the city by the citizen for what the city has done for him in the way of social services already enumerated. If the city repairs the street in front of your property, improves the schools or sand-papers the police, then the city is justified in sending a bill, but to send a bill when no service is rendered, no goods delivered, is unbusinesslike, unethical and not in harmony with economic law.

A building put up by a citizen is not a service rendered by the city and to tax such a building is a gross violation of the rights of private property. In other words it is taking private property for public use. The reason we take private property for public use is because we stupidly give away (through failure to collect) vast sums of publicly created values to private persons who render no service, deliver no goods. They get something for nothing, and some one else, the builder, the producer, gets nothing for something.

In New York City we yearly give away at least \$400,000,000 of publicly created values, and to make good the deficit caused in our natural revenue by this act of folly, we tax, fine and penalize to a degree simply criminal, every man who employs labor and capital in doing useful things.

Our present system of taxation is simply a fine upon industry and a premium upon idleness.

HURTING THE THEATRE

With a 3 per cent. tax rate in about thirty years we take from the theatre owner the price of his theatre. As a matter of fact, he has paid twice for this theatre, once to the builder (that payment was just and right) and a second time to the city, which is not just or right, for the city did not build the theatre and therefore should make no charge. It should charge for the streets, fire department, police, etc., but the value of buildings or any form of capital value is not the measure of the value of the services the

city gives to a citizen. The land value alone is the true and just and only measure of such services.

Fourthly, the excessively high rents paid by our citizens leave a small margin of surplus earnings that can be spent with the theatre, so in a dual way we hurt the theatre industry, first by artificially heavy overhead, and then by impoverishing their customers.

The remedy is to collect publicly created values for the support of public utilities, in lieu of all taxes now levied on any form of industry. In other words, substitute public value in the place of private property, for the support of the city.

Keep in mind all taxes levied on labor or capital values are added into the cost of living.

No tax levied on land value can be added into the cost of anything; only taxes not laid upon publicly created values can be added into the load carried by industry.

Half of City Area Unbuilt

ALTHOUGH the Borough of Manhattan is more densely populated than Shanghai, China, and 2,500,000 persons in five boroughs live in overcrowded "old law" tenement houses, nearly half of the land in New York City is still unbuilt and largely available for dwellings, business and industry, according to a report prepared by the Regional Plan of New York and its Environs.

The Regional Plan survey, based upon five years of intensive study of the metropolitan area within a fifty-mile radius of New York City, finds a definite trend toward decentralization of population in New York City, with indications that the next few years will witness an even greater exodus to the suburbs.

"What may give us hope, if we have the courage to act," the report says, referring to the fact that some parts of the city show low population densities, "is that although certain parts of Manhattan and a few spots in adjoining boroughs and towns are overcrowded, the region as a whole is not populated too densely. The present population of the whole region could be housed within the corporate limits of New York City (297 square miles), at an average density that would be but scarcely higher than the present moderate average throughout Kings County—fifty persons to the acre. The area of the region is, however, 5,528 square miles, or eighteen times the area of New York City.

"On the unbuilt land in New York City," the report continues, "2,500,000 people could be housed without raising the population density of these new areas to more than thirty persons to the acre."

Building Investment for January, 1929.

A MINNESOTA FARMER inquires: "What is farm relief anyway?" Mostly it is the feeling that comes after a strenuous Presidential campaign.—

St. Paul Pioneer Press.

False Education in Our Colleges and Universities

ADDRESS BY EMIL O. JORGENSEN

DIRECTOR OF THE MANUFACTURERS AND MERCHANTS FEDERAL TAX LEAGUE, BEFORE THE THIRD HENRY GEORGE MEMORIAL CONGRESS HELD IN CHICAGO, SEPT. 10-13, 1928.

(Reprinted from *The American Teacher*)

ONE of the saddest questions that I have heard since coming into this convention is "Why in view of the soundness and justice of the Henry George idea and its tremendous importance to every human being, are young people becoming less and less interested in it?"

I don't know that I can give you a full and satisfactory answer to this question. One thing, however, I am very certain of, and that is that the false education regarding the Henry George reform which is streaming through our schools, colleges and universities is chiefly responsible for the declining interest that our young men and women are taking in it.

Now when I say false education I mean just that. I do not have in mind intellectual error; I have in mind untruthfulness and downright dishonesty. I can and do have the highest respect for any one who disagrees with me so long as he is sincere, but I can have absolutely no respect for anyone who disagrees with me when I know that he is not sincere.

Let me give you an illustration of this false education which I feel is doing so much, not merely to turn the minds of our young people against the Henry George reform, but to hold back the movement for the public ownership of public utilities as well.

TAX LEAGUE FORMED

About nine years ago, after a long period of thought and discussion, a group of men met in Chicago and formed the Manufacturers and Merchants Federal Tax League with my friend, Otto Cullman, as chairman. The purpose of this organization was to promote legislation along the Henry George lines and I was called in to act as the Director of Information. We had a bill drawn up which proposed to reduce the tax burden on the fruits of human labor about \$1,000,000,000 by substituting therefor a one per cent. tax on the unearned values of lands and natural resources in excess of \$10,000. This bill, was of course, a long way from the full Single Tax programme of Henry George but it was at least a step in that direction. It was drafted by Jackson H. Ralston and introduced into Congress by Representative Nolan of California and became known as the Ralston-Nolan bill.

We pushed the bill, of course, as hard as we could. Money was easier in 1919 and 1920 than it is now and we were able to send out over the country some two million pamphlets and circulars about it. Much discussion was aroused, a great deal of favorable sentiment was developed

and it looked for a time like the bill might go through, notwithstanding the fact that the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the railroads and other large "vested interests" were doing their best to inflame the farmers against it.

About a year after the bill had been introduced, however, something significant happened. It was announced that Dr. Richard T. Ely had formed in Wisconsin University an "Institute for Research in Land Economics and Public Utilities" which would investigate in an "impartial, disinterested and scientific manner" the various problems pertaining to land, public utilities and taxation. We were delighted to hear it. For any reform, as you know, that is as sound and just in principle as the Henry George reform is, has nothing to lose but everything to gain by having the searchlight of impartial investigation cast upon it and we therefore welcomed the news regarding Dr. Ely's research Institute.

PROPAGANDA—NOT RESEARCH

To our great surprise, however, the Ely Institute—which was privately financed—began its career by accepting contributions from the very corporations whose property interests it was going to investigate and which corporations had always fought any measure looking in the direction of the Henry George idea. To our still greater astonishment Dr. Ely next had Prof. B. H. Hibbard write, in behalf of the Institute, a special article for the National Association of Real Estate Boards—one of the largest corporations back of the Institute—an article attacking the Ralston-Nolan bill in every shape and manner and which article, broadcast by the real estate boards in 1921, probably did more than anything else to bring about the bill's defeat.

It was a very strange beginning for a "disinterested research institute" and it staggered us. It looked very much as though the real purpose of the Institute was not to carry on "impartial, scientific and disinterested research," but to carry on propaganda—propaganda for the benefit of the privileged interests supporting it.

And that this was the real purpose of the Institute has been amply demonstrated by the events that have occurred since this time. Today the Ely Institute, which is housed in Samuel Insull's favorite university—Northwestern—not merely has upon its Board of Trustees such representatives of monopoly as Rufus C. Dawes, William S. Kies, Frank O. Lowden and General Nathan W. MacChesney, but the contributions received from the Rockefeller and Carnegie corporations, from the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the railroads, the public utilities and other interests with big axes to grind (see "*Review of Reviews*," September, 1928) approximate \$100,000 a year. This would certainly indicate that the Institute is not "disinterested."

Again, from the very beginning the Institute has made a practice of submitting its manuscripts (and fifty books

are scheduled to be written) to representatives of the large privileged organizations back of it before these manuscripts have been published—all of which definitely shows that it is not "impartial."

EXPOSING ELY

Finally, the Institute started out on its long task by laying down its conclusions in advance of any investigations—conclusions, by the way, that are worth billions of dollars to the public utility and land speculation interests—all of which shows very plainly that it is not "scientific."

After some four years of "watchful waiting," therefore, we were fully satisfied that the Ely Institute, instead of trying to live up to its claims, was making a foul attempt to wipe us off the earth. And since we were not disposed to be wiped off the earth without at least a struggle in self-defense we boldly decided to attack it.

Our opening gun was fired in July of 1924. In that month we printed in our *Bulletin* an article entitled "Prof. Richard T. Ely Exposed" which was promptly reprinted in pamphlet form. I asked four men—Otto Cullman, Harry H. Willock, James A. Bell and J. H. McGill—to stand the expense of having 20,000 of these pamphlets sent over the country and they did. One thousand copies were sent directly to the authorities and faculty members of Wisconsin University where the Ely Institute was located. The shot hit the mark. Dr. Ely came out with an open letter denouncing the "unfairness" of his assailants while several of his colleagues rushed to his defense. We were pretty hard pressed for a while and many of our own friends withdrew their support but we kept right on. Each succeeding month we came out with a new article in our little paper about the institute.

WARNING FROM LAFOLLETTE

This running fire soon began to tell. The whispering increased and open discussion set in. Senator LaFollette wrote in his magazine an editorial entitled "Monopoly Subsidizes Education" and warned the university authorities to set their house in order. Rumors now began to float. Dr. Ely added Frank O. Lowden and Gen. Nathan MacChesney of Illinois to his Board of Trustees and in July of 1925—just one year after we fired the opening shot—the Ely Institute moved out of state-supported Wisconsin University (where Dr. Ely had been teaching for thirty years) into privately-owned Northwestern University in Chicago. In the following month the Board of Regents of Wisconsin met and passed the following resolution:

"That no gifts, donations nor subsidies shall in future be accepted by or in behalf of the University of Wisconsin from any incorporated educational endowments or organizations of like character."

Well, that was that. But what to do now? The spurious Ely Institute was not dead; it had only moved into safer quarters. After a few more months of "watchful waiting" we therefore decided that the best thing to do

was to lay the matter before some of the leading educational bodies of the land and ask for investigation of it. At once there was a wild scampering for cover. The officials of the American Economic Association and the American Association of University Professors, in particular, refused to look into the Institute regardless of the charges against it.

But not so the American Federation of Teachers. The Chicago local of this organization was the first to inquire into the case and in April of 1926 this local—the Chicago Federation of Men Teachers—passed a resolution denouncing the Ely Institute as “an insidiously dangerous factor in the social and educational fabric of our country.” The national body, however, not wishing to pass judgment on the Institute without the fullest possible investigation of it ordered its Educational Committee to make such an investigation. The Education Committee spent practically a whole year at its task examining books, records and documents and in 1927 reported to the annual convention of the American Federation of Teachers that the Ely Institute was “misusing the conception of research and masquerading under false colors”—in other words, that it was not a true investigational body, as it claimed, but was a huge propaganda organization in disguise.

BATTLE WILL GO ON

This report of the teachers was followed some two months later by a similar report from the Illinois Federation of Labor which, in annual convention assembled, condemned the Ely Institute for sailing under false colors and for “degrading research to the level of special pleading.” The American Federation of Labor, however, which met in annual convention in October not merely declined to concur with the teachers, but positively refused to investigate the matter in any shape or manner.*

This action of the American Federation of Labor is all the more amazing in view of the startling disclosures now being made by the Federal Trade Commission. The Federal Trade Commission has shown that the Ely Institute has received from the National Electric Light Association alone, a total of \$75,000 during the last three years; that the “facts” it has gathered and the reports, pamphlets and textbooks it has published are decidedly favorable to the corporation from which its contributions are received; and that it has gathered unto itself, not merely officials high in public utility circles, but educators who have always been friendly to the utility interests—educators who have repeatedly fought legislation that would reduce the utilities’ profits, who are secretly paid by the utilities to address gatherings of students and teachers, and who are awarded munificent salaries and expense accounts to “survey” text-books and establish utility courses in American schools and colleges.

*Since the above address was delivered, the A. F. of L. in its 1928 convention adopted resolutions condemning those institutions which have proven to be subsidized by special interests and which are “carrying on propaganda under the guise of disinterested research.”—Editor.

Notwithstanding the strange action of the A. F. of L., however, the storm of indignation against the Ely Institute is slowly but surely rising. Civic associations, reform leagues and other bodies, one after another, are now voicing their protest in resolutions against it and it may well be that the A. F. of L. itself will soon reverse its decision. The publishers of the Institute’s books, we have reason to believe, are growing alarmed at the course events are taking and if the publishers once refuse to accept new manuscripts from the Institute the financial support back of it will soon peter out.

However, in a matter of this kind it is never safe to count your chickens before they are hatched. The Ely Institute is still going strong and every fortification is being thrown around it. Its vitality appears to be unimpaired and its financial support is certainly as great as ever before. It has turned out seven crops of teachers, it has published fourteen of its proposed fifty text-and-reference books, and these teachers and text-books it has, with the aid of the public utilities and the real estate boards, now got into more than three hundred schools, colleges and universities in the United States.* So while the movement has been started that will certainly finish the Ely Institute if it keeps on, there is always a danger that it might not keep on. And if the movement does not keep on to the bitter end the great battle for honest education will be lost instead of won.

*This, however, is only a small indication of the real length of the Institute’s arm. Ely’s popular old text-books, for instance—notably his “Outlines of Economics,” and his “Elementary Principles of Economics”—two text-books used in more than 2,200 high schools and colleges in the United States, do not now merely bear the name of the Institute but they have been skillfully revised during the last few years to conform to the teachings of the Institute. These two text-books alone are now influencing the minds of at least a half million students a year.—E. O. J.

The Coming World Conference

FROM July 27 to August 2 the Fourth International Conference of Georgists will meet in Edinburgh, Scotland, and a large attendance is expected. On this occasion will be celebrated the Fiftieth Anniversary of the publication of “Progress and Poverty.”

Arrangements are in the hands of the United Committee at 11 Tothill Street, London, England, and all those desiring reservations should communicate with the Committee. A great number of visitors from this side of the water are anticipated. Further details will be printed in forthcoming LAND AND FREEDOM.

IN the Los Angeles *Tidings* (Catholic Weekly) Mr. William Lacy, President Community Welfare Foundation, says:

“Very many large fortunes have been made through increases in the value of real estate. I feel that a very strong responsibility rests upon those whose material prosperity has been increased in this way.”

Gasoline Taxes

I THINK the new gasoline taxes most dangerous, bringing a great revenue and with the factitious justice of taxing only the users of automobiles. It ought to be shown up; a plea pro and con would attract attention, with well known names signed to them.

The gasoline tax has already raised the "gas bootlegger" as well as the horde of spies and tax collectors.

It penalizes travel and also the users of gas for farm tractors, for heating, light and power.

It is a subsidy to the coal owners, and to the railroads, alleviating their most serious competition.

It falls most heavily on the poor who cannot afford to buy in quantity or to carry the gas through States. It presses most heavily where the roads are worst.

It is passed on to the consumer, with a profit.

Cheap gas vastly raises rural land values—this is a plan to avoid their paying for the benefit.

The amount of the tax has no limit except, as far as can be seen, "what the traffic will bear."

Which of the canons of taxation does it not violate?

Desperate Florida has a 5c a gallon tax, say 25% ad retail valorem. Think of the comic sociology that approves of goods legally made "worth" a third more on one side of an imaginary line or of a creek than on the other!

—BOLTON HALL.

Subway Problem Is Now Clear

THE air is very much cleared as the result of P. R. T's action in declining to renew the Broad Street subway lease upon the present terms.

It is now established that as a business venture the subway is a money loser, not a money maker.

Somebody has to pay those losses. There are only two parties who can be called upon to do so. One of them is the car rider. The other is the taxpayer.

If the car rider pays, it means a higher rate of fare on the subway, or a general fare increase upon the entire city transit system.

To this Mitten Management has announced its opposition. It is bad business. It is unfair to the car rider.

The taxpayers voted to build the subway. Its construction has immensely increased the value of property along its route, and the increase has only just begun. Real estate interests and business men are the chief beneficiaries.

There is no reason why these beneficiaries should get away with fortunes at the expense either of the general taxpayer or of the car rider. They are required by every equitable consideration to share their benefits, and this they can do by paying taxes to the city commensurate with the advantages the city has conferred upon them by the construction of the subway.

—Philadelphia Daily News.

Address of C. LeBaron Goeller

HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, SEPT. 10, 1928

I HAVE selected a text from the gospel by Henry George found in his book "Progress and Poverty," Chap. I, and the tenth paragraph:

"Some get an infinitely better and casier living now than before the introduction of labor saving machinery, but others find it hard to get a living at all."

The margin of production has always been of interest to me because it is so closely associated with the law of wages, and the law of wages is the central point of interest in the Single Tax system.

As we all know, "Wages depend upon the margin of production, or upon the produce that labor can obtain at the highest point of natural productiveness open to it without the payment of rent." Also that all wages depend finally upon the lowest wages, in exactly the same way that every floor of a building depends ultimately upon the lowest course of the footing of the foundation—and someone has maliciously called the very poorest people "the mud sills of society."

Now, since the raising of wages is the ultimate object of the Single Tax philosophy, as Henry George intimated in "Progress and Poverty," in Book III, Chapter III, —the changing of "Progress and Poverty" into "Progress and Prosperity" the whereabouts of this margin, and the raising of it so that there will be no involuntary poverty becomes of exceptional importance.

The margin of production has international relations and the high point several centuries ago was in newly discovered America which became the Mecca of the less fortunate people of European countries. In Colonial days the margin of production was simply "a little further west." If a man didn't like his present job, or opportunity closed against him he pulled up stakes and went west where he could get free land. The American realm was so vast that for three centuries wages were at a maximum reckoned as they should be as a proportion of the produce. The man at the margin paid no rent to any one—all that he produced was his wages. Thus when my grandfather Goeller came to America about the year 1825 and established a bakery on Broome Street in New York City, he said that this country was "a land flowing with milk and honey." But just before he died in 1869 he said that it was no longer a land of "milk and honey"—some were finding it hard to get a living even then. Thus, roughly speaking, we might say that the margin of production was at its height in '49, when gold was washed from placer claims in California. After those claims were worked out and mines had to be operated, the margin fell, and with it fell wages.

Prior to the middle of the nineteenth century wages were high in proportion to actual produce, and in '49 in California wages were nearly 100 per cent. of the produce,

allowing something for interest—but there was no rent. Simultaneously with the fall in the margin of production there was a great advance in the making of labor saving machinery. The total of produce vastly increased—the worker got about the same quantity—the same living—but continuously received less and less as a proportion. At one time he received nearly 100 per cent. of what he produced. Then this proportion gradually grew less and less as machinery made his product more and more, till now in many cases he gets no more than one per cent. of what he produces. In fact government statistics say that each farm worker now produces about one hundred times as much as he did before the introduction of labor saving machinery. This large portion which the worker fails to get the socialist calls a surplus product; however, we define it as monopoly and speculative rent.

This surplus product, or monopoly and speculative rent we propose to give back to the worker through the destruction of land monopoly. We propose a single tax on ground rent—a tax that cannot be shifted by the land owner onto the land user, and will therefore raise wages to the full earnings of labor.

At present the margin of production is about as low as it can get, which is shown by the army of the unemployed that exists in "prosperous" times, so-called. Late President Harding estimated that in "good times" there were normally two million men out of work. At present when times are not so good there are probably at least five million men out of work, men who don't know which way to turn—five million men competing for jobs. And when there are more men than jobs wages tend downward.

At present the margin of production is strung around such places as the Great American Desert, and along the sides of inaccessible mountain ranges. It is marked by the fact that land now "free" is perfectly worthless, and to get to this worthless land one has to pass millions of acres of uncultivated but monopolized land that would support many, many times our present population in comfort.

Therefore we must raise the margin of production to bring better and better land into use and prevent any dogs-in-the-manger from refusing others permission to live on the earth—except at a price. Thus only can wages be raised.

We are all anxious to put Single Tax across and suggestions of method are always in order. Far be it from me to discourage anyone in any way in his efforts to bring the Single Tax principle into operation. What I want to say is to propose a mental experiment that Henry George was so fond of. So a hypothetical treatment of the subject is in no way a criticism of work now being done.

Therefore, imagine with me for a moment, that we are to stop all propaganda work in a city like New York, for instance. We are aiming to abolish poverty in New York City. We would abolish the slums, relieve the congested

tion, raise wages, and lower rents and the cost of living. Instead of working in the city itself we start to work in the surrounding territory. We start in Westchester County. This county adjoins the City on the North, and is largely a wilderness. A number of years ago, while I still lived in New York, I went to Hastings on the Hudson and then to the end of the trolley line to Uniontown, a couple of miles back in the country, eastward. I walked for several hours toward the east and came out at Tuckahoe. And a more complete wilderness it would be hard to find, not of tangled underbrush as in the Adirondacks perhaps, but of desolation. It was the desolation of the deer parks of England and Scotland. I saw a few Italians shoveling at a manure heap, one rabbit, and a herd of about five cows. And this, remember, only a few miles from a city of millions of souls.

Suppose with me for another moment, that we concentrated all of our energies to get the Single Tax principle into operation in Westchester County and the other Counties adjoining New York. We are successful, and the tax on ground rent is 100 cents on the dollar. The bottom drops out of the land market in those counties. The selling price of land in those counties would be nil. Having no selling price the land in that particular sense would be free. No one would pay rent to any lords of the soil. They would pay a relatively small tax, namely the economic rent, to the community. Rents would fall very low, the cost of living would fall, and wages would go up.

Now, what would happen in the City of New York, even admitting as we do in our mental experiment, that there has been no Single Tax work done in that city. Would not people tend to go to those places that were more favorable? And would not that very tendency reduce rents and the cost of living in the city? Not so very many people would have to leave the city to force an improvement in the city, but the fact that they *could* go would be sufficient to raise wages and lower the cost of living in the city. It will take very little consideration to see that this is so. And I will quote Henry George on this very point,—"Progress and Poverty," Bk. 5, Chap. 2:

"Put to anyone capable of consecutive thought this question: Suppose there should arise from the English Channel or the German Ocean a No-man's land on which common labor to an unlimited amount should be able to make ten shillings a day and which should remain unappropriated and free of access, like the commons which once comprised so large a part of English soil. What would be the effect upon wages in England?"

"He would at once tell you that common wages throughout England must soon increase to ten shillings a day.

"And in response to another question: 'What would be the effect on rents?' He would at a moment's reflection say that rents must necessarily fall; and if he thought out the next step he would tell you that all this would happen without any very large part of English labor being

diverted to the new natural opportunities, or the forms and direction of industry being much changed; only that kind of production being abandoned which now yields to labor and to landlord together less than labor could secure on the new opportunities. The great rise in wages would be at the expense of rent."

In other words it would appear that we must do vastly more work in the rural districts of the country than we are now doing. If we work Single Tax from the rural districts toward the cities, instead of from the cities outward we can figure on quicker returns in prosperity from the farmer upward than we can from working in the opposite direction. The farmer, of all the workers in the country needs our help most, and he needs it now, as evidenced by the two great political parties so vainly trying to solve this very question—to get the farmers' vote.

Let us work for the farmer by saying, "Abolish all of the farmers' taxes except a small fee determined primarily by the United States Geologic and Geodetic Survey—an entirely non-partisan and non-political commission." In other words, the farmer would pay instead of his present taxes on everything he owns and uses, a small sum determined by his location on the map. We would tax him on nothing but his latitude and longitude. For even the words "land values" are misunderstood by professional "economists." And our friend Peter Schwander of Texas, our "Horatio," remarks upon this so appropriately that I cannot refrain from quoting him. He writes:

"What are land values? So-called land value is not the value of the land, any more than "moon light" is the light of the moon. The moon has no light. It merely reflects it from the sun, just as the land reflects its value from the pressure of population and the expenditure of public funds. "The Single Tax," so-called, is not a tax on land. It is not a tax on anything. It is not a tax at all. It is a charge levied against location owners for benefits conferred. It is a return to the public treasure of public values collected by private tribute takers."

We aim to relieve the congestion of the cities, to stop the migration from country to city, and give city advantages to the rural dwellers. But some may contend that people do not like the country, and that they like the city, slums or no slums. I do not believe it. Many, many people detest the cities and love the country but are driven off the farms because of our iniquitous system of taxation. Given the opportunity they will delight in running a farm. I offer just one illustration.

A friend of mine, a farmer, owned a farm a little to the west of Union. His wife had a breakdown and had to go to a sanitarium. This left the man all alone to run a good sized farm. He didn't like being completely alone, and couldn't run the farm alone so he inserted a small want-ad in the *Binghamton Press* and—to me this is one of the most remarkable things I ever heard of—he received sixty answers, in a manufacturing community where practically everybody was busy at a factory speed-up pace and low

wages. One opportunity was jumped at by sixty applicants. Factory people are being driven to madness by the relentless drive, drive, drive, and the perpetual speed-up of factory life, and their ideal is to get back on a farm. Here was an opportunity they could handle, and the sixty answers indicate a marked tendency.

"Sixty-to-one!" People do want to get back on the farm. There are many abandoned farms. The Single Tax system is the "how" to get the "sixty" back on the farm. The abandoned farms were abandoned because it did not pay to work them. We can make those farms pay by removing all restrictions upon their operation, charging only the small fee determined by latitude and longitude. And it seems to me that it might be worth while to be a little more explicit in our talking Single Tax to people who are totally unfamiliar with the language we employ. We would create no new governmental machinery, but there should be a land office in every state where abandoned farms and other vacant land could be applied for by any one wishing to use land. The "sixty" would find that land itself would have no selling price—they would not have to buy any land. The rental value would be paid annually to the state, and there would have to be an orderly way to place those "sixty" back onto the farms without doing injustice to anyone.

Thus, by showing city people that the slums in the city can be wiped out by making abandoned farms, and all farms in fact, very profitable, we have a better talking point than by merely telling them that Single Tax would bring prosperity. Most people who are not accustomed to thinking in Political Economy must have concrete examples, stories, parables, etc., to show them even the most simple economic truths.

Words! They are not merely the means of expressing our thoughts. They are the very tools of thought itself. "People do not argue with the teachings of Henry George. They do not know them" simply because words have varying meanings and we must watch our every word in order to get our thought to our hearers. Words are of such vast importance that I quote from Herbert Spencer in his *Book on First Principles*, Book 2, Chap. III, on "Space, Time, Matter, Motion and Force:"

"That skeptical state of mind which the criticisms of Philosophy usually produce, is, in great measure, caused by the misinterpretation of words. A sense of universal illusion ordinarily follows the reading of metaphysics; and is strong in proportion as the argument has appeared conclusive. This sense of universal illusion would probably never have arisen had the terms used been always rightly construed. Unfortunately, these terms have by association acquired meanings that are quite different from those given to them in philosophical discussions; and the ordinary meanings being unavoidably suggested, there results more or less of that dream-like idealism which is so incongruous with our instinctive convictions."

The Progress Of The Ages

PHENOMENA—the effectual relationships of all being and life—necessarily vary in precise proportion to the total sum of affecting causes. All changes, at least in their material aspects, seem solely consequent to physical and chemical coalescences, modifications and distributions of the inexplicably precreated elemental electrons of the Universe.

Electrons, through Nature's integrating processes, originally composed only the simplest gases, water and solids (or land). From their combined interactions appear planets, and probably at least the beginning of life, and thought. Thence are ever arising progressively the moral, social and economic levels of men, of nations and of the world.

The two previous paragraphs are intended merely to preface and emphasize the universally recognized fact that, regardless of how treated, neither air, water or land are of human creation. Being natural products, they rightfully call for very different treatment than political economy accords to human products.

The dearth of advance in general prosperity appears thus far due chiefly to the ill effects of unsound or dishonest economics. True economic laws, always for the best interests of all, must be logically grounded upon the highest types of ethic-inspired thought. Here lies the stumbling block of all nations.

In every realm of life, dependent upon capability and worth, the trend of all social and economic progress appears unmistakably toward ultimate universal equity. Regardless of inequitable statute enactments, attempted contraventions of the operation of natural laws are, in their ultimate, wholly impossible. As violations unfailingly enforce their own unescapable penalties, neither men nor nations can secure much, or wide, or long continued unfair gains through special privileges.

True and unabridged equality of economic opportunity, for all men in the Universe, must finally become the statute as well as the natural basis of all individual right of property. For every man has always possessed exclusive natural title to all fruits resultant to expenditure of his own physical and mental energies. It is equally as true that just title to all "unearned increment"—the socially-created land values produced solely by communities as a whole, and never by individuals—by like right of production as certainly belongs to the communities or states creating such values.

The foregoing declarations, regardless of all contrary statute laws, are incontrovertably sound fundamentals of both correct political economy and the highest related concepts of moral conduct. Far-reaching in their possibilities, they are supremely wise and altruistically practical. So long as correctly based politico-economic laws are flaunted, maximum general prosperity is impossible and

both domestic and international peace must rest upon a precarious basis.

In proportion as true economic laws are disregarded, as national population pressures increase per square mile, general prosperity must decrease. And, so-called semi-recurring "business cycles," or "economic depressions," will eventually be found to be plainly needless results rather than mysterious unavoidable causes.

Enormous absorptions and wasteful expenditures of the people's farm and factory products, now exalted as taxes chiefly levied upon all productive and distributive interests and applied to public purposes, especially when devoted to roads and streets, advance land values only. All such enhancements in land values constitute a public liability, upon which the prevailing rent and interest rates must be individually met annually by perpetual indirect taxes that are reflected in increased costs of production to every productive interest.

Truly correct as the idea certainly is, all hoped-for general economic gains to the people incident to a state manufacturing and consuming its own raw products, the gain is ultimately absorbed in economic rent, with no possible gain to any productive, distributive, or constructive professional interests.

Herein may be most clearly seen the fundamental cause of unnecessarily high costs of every constructive interest and of living, which must be met finally by consumers.

To tax individually-produced products and business at the same rate as unearned increment (as is the rule under the "general property tax"), is to unfairly augment all costs of living by needlessly burdening individual and corporate production. And, only holders of title to unearned increment can be the gainers. By still further exempting from taxation the relative proportions of communally-produced land values (the rightful earnings of communities and states), all political sub-divisions of government are unwittingly accentuating grave errors of economic folly.

Such land-value tax exemptions, being favorable only to non-producers, necessitate the heaping of additional needless burdens upon production and distribution. These discriminations, by the ever increasing land-values and land rents exclusive of improvements, tend toward artificially advancing the cost of every factor of production and distribution. Every productive business is thus discouraged in exact proportion to the credulousness of a people temporarily permitting such economic injustice.

For communities and states to take by taxation as great proportion of the population-produced increment of land-values as actual costs of government may require, leaving all labor products, productive business, incomes and improvements untaxed, appears to be the only equitable method of deriving adequate, naturally-produced revenues for every sub-division of government.

This simple method untaxes all constructive business. Here seems to be the remedy—the only possible construc-

tive cure—for periodic “business depressions” and so-called “profitless profits.” Only in this direction appears to lie the surest pathway to the truest and greatest progress of the ages.

Ella Wheeler Wilcox has aptly said:

“To sit in silence, when we should protest,
Makes cowards out of men. The human race
Has climbed on protest. Had no voice been raised
Against injustice, ignorance and lust,
The Inquisition yet would serve the law
And guillotines decide our least disputes.”

—K. P. ALEXANDER.

Land Values

WHEN Judge Gary's father reached Chicago, landing at Fort Dearborn in 1831, he had \$1,000, but carefully refrained from investing it along the lake front, says the Portland *Realtor*. Someone tried to “unload” a lake front farm on him for \$1,000. But Erastus Gary, father of the steel king, couldn't be caught with that proposition; “the land,” he said, “will never be of value.”

If the old gentleman had invested his thousand dollars in lake front land and kept it, that one farm now would be worth \$100,000,000 and a great deal more.

When you invest in real estate, especially if you intend to keep it for your children, as you should do, remember that the value of your land is created by people; human beings create land value.

A gold mine or an oil well may make land valuable temporarily. But permanent value comes from human life.

If a man asks you what you think such a piece of land is worth, you ask how many people pass by it on foot, the kind of people, rich or poor, what would that land be worth for a house to live in. Ask how much merchandise could be sold in a store on that corner and what kind of merchandise. Land on which you can sell pig iron has one value. Land on which you can sell diamonds or cigars has a higher value.

But human beings give all the real value in the long run.

The little fort built on the edge of Lake Michigan to keep out the Indians becomes a city of millions. The farm that could be bought for a thousand dollars becomes worth a hundred million and three times that.

And the gigantically increased value goes to the man that owns the land, although he may not have added anything to that value.

—Pasadena (Calif.) *Star-News*.

Will Atkinson Abridgements

WILL ATKINSON has placed in our hands a large quantity of his abridgements of “Progress and Poverty” and “The Land Question.” These will be sent while they last at 2 cents each in quantities of fifty or one hundred.

What the Great Have Said of the Land Rights of Men

YOU recently published a letter from a Single Taxer who, discouraged by the slight effect he has seen from his preaching of that Gospel, begins to doubt as to whether he is right and asks your opinion. You tell him that long, human experience has shown the Single Tax to be wrong.

Now, Mr. Editor, I hate to destroy your simple faith in the righteousness of things as they are as to earth-ownership, but I must remind you that many hoary wrongs—slavery for instance—had been just as universally accepted as land-ownership and for a longer period, and yet have gone into the discard as immoral. And to strengthen my compatriot's failing faith allow me to quote a few of the many things notable men have had to say on this subject.

“The earth He hath given to the children of men”

“The land shall not be sold for ever.”—*Holy Writ*.

“The earth is given to mankind in common.”—JOHN LOCKE.

“Those who make private property of the gift of God pretend in vain to be innocent.”—POPE GREGORY THE GREAT.

“The land of every country belongs to the people of that country.”

“No man made the land; it is the original inheritance of the whole species.”—JOHN STUART MILL.

“The earth is the common property of the human race.”—THOMAS PAINE.

“The earth is common to all.”—TOLSTOY.

“The earth is given as common stock for man to labor and live on.”

“The earth belongs in usufruct to the living, the dead have neither power nor right over it.”—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

“The notion of selling the land of the World-Creator is a ridiculous impossibility.”—THOMAS CARLYLE.

“Land is not and cannot be property.”—FROUDE.

“Landlords are the only great body of men whose interest is diametrically opposed to the interest of the nation.”—H. S. BUCKLE.

“Equity does not permit property in land.”

“The right of mankind at large to the earth's surface is still valid, all deeds, customs and laws to the contrary notwithstanding.”—HERBERT SPENCER.

“My reason teaches me the land cannot be sold.”—BLACK HAWK.

“The land belongs to all for the use of each.”—TECUMSEH.

“Every proprietor of land owes to the community a ground rent.”—THOMAS PAINE.

“If all men were tenants to the public it would put an end to taxes and leave never a beggar.”—WM. PENN.

“A tax on ground rent would not raise the rent of houses.”—ADAM SMITH.

Rather a damning indictment of our present land system, is it not? Evidently there is a respectable minority which agrees with you, Mr. Editor, as to the righteousness of open property in land.

—HAROLD SUDELL in Philadelphia *Ledger*.

WHAT is there for which life gives us opportunity, that can be compared with the effort to do what we may—be it ever so little—to improve social conditions and enable other lives to reach fuller, nobler development?—HENRY GEORGE.

One by One the Old Guard Passes. . . ”

WARREN WORTH BAILEY said it once, and now he is gone himself. Gone in the flesh, but never in the memory of his comrades. His quiet dry humor, his magnetic wit, his ability to say the things one remembers, these made his steadfast allegiance to the good cause more valuable. He built up a going concern in his paper which had wide influence, and yet he never compromised, never swerved aside from the line of clear thinking. Not even the danger to any journal of mob-hysteria passed could frighten Warren Worth Bailey.

In remembering Bailey and Johnstown, one remembers another sterling comrade, also gone from us, who worked in the same town, quietly, less in the public eye than Warren Worth Bailey, but upholding Bailey's efforts in the advertised drudgery of organization, of the day-by-day toil at the little things that count, . . . "Pat" Mahaffey. No better men than these two ever worked our ranks.

Well done, thou good and faithful servant . . . can indeed be said of these two Johnstown comrades.

SYMPATHY of American Single Taxers will go out to Antonio Albendin, the leader of the Spanish group, on the death of his wife on November 16. Donna Albendin cared her husband's interest fully. She was with him at the Copenhagen Conference, following the sessions with active enjoyment, apparently not hampered by the fact that she knew but one language, French, outside of her native tongue. It was because of this that I came to know Donna Albendin well at the Conference, as my bungling and inelegant French was at least sufficient to explain many things to her. This quiet matron with the youthfully eager eyes was content to be there merely as her husband's wife. And yet, at the dinner in Viborg, on the morrow, she came out of her modest seclusion with a graceful little speech of appreciation and compliment to Mrs. Mahaffey. Those of us who have known Donna Maria Garcia Albendin will send thoughts of sincere sympathy to her husband in his loss of a true helpmeet.

—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

The Passing of John Filmer

ON January 12 of this year at the residence of Mrs. Thomas P. Beggs the usual birthday party was tendered to our old friend John Filmer. On that day he had attained his ninety-second year. There were present on that occasion Mr. and Mrs. Beggs, Mr. and Mrs. Heeg, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred J. Boulton, Mr. and Mrs. Mansur, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Aiken, Miss Jennie Rogers, Oscar Geiger, Thomas Ryan, W. B. Vernam, Miss Corinne Carpenter and others—about 25 in all. A few days later John Filmer passed to his rest.

Because of the suddenness of this event we are unable at this writing to prepare an adequate account of his life and services to the cause, which must wait for the coming issue. There is no sorrow associated with the death of such a man, for mentally vigorous to the last, though always of a frail physique, he had enjoyed his life of service and passed with the love of a great circle of friends and the conviction of a life of usefulness hereafter.

Colorado

MR. BARNEY HAUGHEY, of Denver, has sent out a letter and pamphlet telling of his work in Colorado and what he proposes to do.

The next election in Denver will be held May 16, and any Single Tax petition will have to be filed thirty days prior thereto. The petition must be signed by 5,000 electors and by starting thus early Mr. Haughey and his associated workers are assured that that number of signers can be secured in time and at small cost—certainly not more than five cents a name. A few volunteer workers will obtain a good proportion of these.

The proposed amendment provides that personal property and improvements shall be exempt from the city tax at the rate of ten per cent. each year until all such taxes are abolished. This is the same provision that four years ago received thirty per cent. of Denver's vote. Mr. Haughey thinks that if one thousand dollars can be secured there is a reasonable assurance of the measure being carried.

An intensive campaign will be pursued and a house-to-house canvass, with distribution of leaflets explaining the measure placed in every household together with Will Atkinson's abridgement of "Progress and Poverty." The literature will be prepared by Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown, of the University of Missouri, and James Bell, of Elkhart, Indiana, will help with the printing.

Just now the attention of the people of Denver is being called to the fact that not a single bid has been forthcoming for the old court house square when it was offered for sale. If the agitation to reduce the speculative gain from increased land values has thrown a scare into the land monopolists of Denver it seems to our Single Tax friends a fitting time to introduce a Single Tax measure to the voters of Denver. They will be told why the big land speculators

hesitate to take a chance by bidding for the court house square.

It is proposed by the Committee to get paraders with banners reading:

"The annual rental value of the Court House Square was created by all the people of Denver and it rightfully belongs to all. Therefore the voters should see that this rental value goes into the public purse and not into private pockets."

It is believed that banners so inscribed will hasten the getting of signatures to the petition and arouse the citizens to the real situation.

Chicago Activities

THE first dinner of the season of the Chicago Single Tax Club was significant for three reasons: first, the speech of John Z. White showed that twenty-five years of continuous propaganda has only inspired him to greater heights; second, the speech of Professor Paul H. Douglas was a word from the enlightened currents of thought in American universities; and third, the talk of Theodore Saunders demonstrated that a new generation has caught the spirit of Henry George.

John Z. White said that our government is an aristocracy with some democratic modifications, with property rights protected and human rights denied and neglected. The real question is not, as Malthus contended, that there are too many people, for Ireland had the same trouble with 4,000,000 people as it had with 8,000,000. Mr. White referred to one of H. G. Well's satirical novels in which in a time of business depression the laboring people were put to sleep until "times grew better."

"Democracy to be a success," said Mr. White, "must be simple." But he pointed out, the Supreme Court has been complicating the simplicity of our government. "We do not live under the Constitution of the United States but under the decisions of the Supreme Court." The Dartmouth College Case decision used the power of the whole people to give the power of taxation to a privileged few, and a government is not sovereign if it can not levy taxes and levy war. One way to regulate land is to tax it. A way to regulate public utility magnates like Samuel Insull is not to permit them to put in their price any public value.

Mr. White condemned the Democratic Party for not having said "a word of democracy in fifty years." Like the Church, the Democratic Party has neglected its duty. Since they gave up to slavery they have given up every democratic principle that Jefferson gave them, Mr. White contended. It should be the purpose of the Democratic Party to be constantly holding up before the people democratic ideals. The Church should not build great places of worship while a single person dies of hunger. "The

ground is ours," he asserted. "It must be administered with equity and justice."

PROFESSOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS

Professor Paul H. Douglas, of the Department of Economics in the University of Chicago, told of the importance of proportional representation to all liberal, minority groups such as the Single Taxers. He said he was in complete harmony with the great principle of collecting the community created value of the land but that he didn't believe in the *Single Tax*. He also favors such taxes as the Inheritance Tax. He said that the struggle for public ownership will be comparable to the struggles for abolition and prohibition.

In bringing out the vital necessity for proportional representation, Prof. Douglas said, "Creative forces are trying to break into existence. When young they are weak. Our whole political system makes it difficult for new ideas to come in. It keeps down real issues."

Under the present electoral system when the majority wins, 49% may have no representation at all. Al Smith got 40% of the vote but only 15% of the electors, Prof. Douglas pointed out. By helping to elect the man we like best we often cause the election of the man we like least.

Prof. Douglas explained the Hare System of proportional representation. Under this system each group could always have a forum to keep alive issues and arouse discussion, at the same time with a hope for political victory.

THEODORE SAUNDERS

"I sometimes fear, ladies and gentlemen, that we still live in a weak and insufficient age." So began Theodore Saunders in his talk on the "Relation of Art to Henry George's Theory of Economics." "We devote ourselves to superficialities and polish the surface till we rub it thin," continued the twenty year old artist. "We follow to the seat of government men who walk backwards in circles with their mouths continually open and leaving a stream of platitudes and glittering trivialities.

"In hoping for order we endure imperialism. We allow to spring up about us a caste system worse if anything than a system which evolves through religious distinctions, in as much as it strikes more deeply." Mr. Saunders further stated that the need of the artist for artistic expression is satisfied when he has finished his picture, but that the same need of the public is not satisfied until the picture is hung. It is that lapse between the time the painting is finished and the time the painting is hung, in which the artist must live, and which makes economic conditions of prime importance to him. The Public, in addition, must be economically able to enjoy art. Mr. Saunders concluded by saying, "St. Gaudens looked upon the Single Tax as a symbol of perfect democracy and perfect freedom."

Dr. Walter Verity told how Chicago is 50% Single Taxed already in so far as its public improvements are largely paid for by the land values which they create. Henry H

Hardinge made an appeal for financial aid for the Chicago Single Tax Club. Clayton J. Ewing, president, told of plans for the coming season, while George Strachan as toastmaster told a flock of good Scotch jokes and stories.

At its second dinner of the season, on December 13, the Chicago Single Tax Club had as its guest of honor and principal speaker George H. Duncan of New Hampshire. In an informal but exceedingly practical and encouraging talk, Mr. Duncan told of the progress that Single Tax is making in all parts of the country. He pointed out that the fact that the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Assessors of New Hampshire had asked him to speak before them on the Single Tax was evidence in itself of great advance.

Mr. Duncan said that the gasoline tax was a tax in the right direction in so far as its advocates say, "He who benefits should pay the bill." The Auto Association of California has already come to ask, "But why should the motorist pay the bill for good roads when the land along side the good roads gets the benefit in increased land values?"

The Occupation Tax of Minnesota is an application of the Single Tax in regard to the natural resources such as iron and coal. It has been tested satisfactorily in the State Court and the Supreme Court of the United States. In other states it is known as a Heritage Tax as distinguished from the Severance Tax.

The taking of any value created by special governmental privilege, Mr. Duncan pointed out, is akin to the Single Tax and should be encouraged.

Most important of all, Mr. Duncan said, we must be patient.—We must understand underlying principles and be practical politicians taking advantage of every opportunity. He commended the work of such men as George Strachan and Clayton J. Ewing in their work with the Farm Bureau people. Since we want more and better things all the time it is foolish to talk of reduced taxes; rather, we should talk of taking community created values to pay for those more and better things.

Mr. Henry L. T. Tideman made a valuable contribution to the problem of how to "Talk the Single Tax." He said that a tax should be explained as a payment for public service, that the annual value of the land should be pointed out as the reflector of the value of the public service rendered, and that this annual land-value should be spoken of as the basis of payment for the public services rendered. Mr. Tideman emphasized the absurdity of such "solutions" to our economic problems as birth control, prohibition, consumer's cooperation, and tinkering with the tariff, in lieu of the far reaching effects of land-value taxation.

The programme was opened with a tribute to the character and life work of the late Warren Worth Bailey by John Lawrence Monroe. Hon. Abram D. Gash, noted Chicago attorney, was toastmaster.

BOOK REVIEWS

HISTORY OF SINGLE TAX ENCLAVES

We have received Vol. VI. of the series of Enclaves of Economic Rent, fathered by Fiske Warren, and giving the history of Single Tax colonies, including Fairhope, Arden, Free Acres, Halidon, San Jordi, and Tahanto, the last three named established by Mr. Warren.

This volume contains "How to Destroy the Rum Power," the notable essay by Henry George which appeared in the *Arena* during the editorship of B. O. Flower. Besides this is an Historical Account of the Application of the Single Tax, consisting of extracts from the writings of James Dundas White, Emil O. Jorgensen and Joseph Dana Miller, forming when combined a singularly impressive record of progress.

The volume contains 283 pages which give an accurate survey of pretty nearly everything the reader will want to know about the advance of our movement in legislation and the principles and mode of operation of these Single Tax colonies. It will be sent for 25 cents postpaid by Mr. Warren to any one who applies. This offer includes editions of the volumes dealing with enclavial history and progress for 1921 and 1926, editions for 1920 and 1927, in accordance with the plan of publication, being quoted at a higher figure. Address Fiske Warren, Harvard, Mass.

—J. D. M.

DR. BRUNK GIVES US A NEW BOOK*

Our readers know Dr. Brunk. They know how indefatigably he has investigated the little known facts regarding land ownership in America, and with what effectiveness he has marshalled the often disgraceful revelations affecting the Fathers of the American Revolution. So, knowing his temper and his skill as well as his courage, they will be glad to welcome this new volume from his pen, a forcibly written book instinct with passionate hatred of injustice.

Some of his sentences are arresting, such as "Property in land has been the source of five sixths of our law and nearly all our law suits." "Feudal ownership of fertile or valuable lands has been at the root of all War and War preparation."

Under the heading, "The World a Single Economic Organism" the author tells us of the natural forces of justice, and he exults: "Take courage, brother. Nature is on your side. It is the foe of all the bubbles and frailties of man." And when he musters his array of facts that are to determine the final struggle whether there shall be a Wealth or Labor domination he does it in a way singularly impressive. It is a note of hope he sounds in these 260 pages.

It is nothing less than a new constitution that Dr. Brunk proposes. He has worked on the details with great care, dividing the United States into 12 provinces in place of 48 states, which would admit of the abolition of a multiplicity of laws as well as the laws that conflict. What he says of the Precinct Unit, which he calls the "basis of Mass Government," would take more space for its consideration than can be given to it here.

There is perhaps too great a tendency to provide for too many things, a fault of nearly every writer who has hitherto attempted to create a Utopia. Dr. Brunk, however, does not belong to this school; he would reduce government to the minimum, and whatever is necessary to be done by the community in its corporate capacity he would bring close to the people.

We would not without further consideration reject all the multiplicity of suggestions Dr. Brunk has set down. No blanket verdict is possible with reference to a book such as this. It is something to be studied and argued about—not to be dismissed in a column book review.

*Mass Rule Government by Thomas L. Brunk. Paper cover, 261 pages. Price \$1. Union Advocate Press, Sioux City, Iowa.

Dr. Brunk is a thinker. He knows his economics and he has made some important contributions, as we have indicated, to the history of land ownership. When he sets himself to establish a new political commonwealth he is not to be disregarded as attempting too colossal a task.

Nevertheless, it may be permitted us to say that the mistake, it seems to us, is that our author gives to government an importance it does not merit. Laws and constitutions become innocuous as soon as popular tendencies assert themselves strongly; either they are modified or lapse into disuse. And economic conditions act upon political forms, so that their character seems after all of minor consequence.

But it is because of the difficulty of dealing adequately with a work of this kind in the space permitted us that we urge our readers to send to Dr. Brunk, Alton, Ill., or to his publishers, for a copy of the work.

—J. D. M.

THIS MAN ADAMS*

This book is written in the modern "Jazz" style of biography.

Our author labors hard to prove that John Adams survives. The most convincing proof he can give is a letter to John Taylor in which Adams writes, "After all I am not yet dead."

This reviewer prefers the verdict of less biased contemporaries.

Thomas Paine, whose judgment, we submit, is more impartial, in a letter to George Washington dated July 30, 1796, wrote.

"John Adams is one of those men who never contemplated the origin of government, or comprehended anything of first principles. If he had, he might have seen that the right to set up and establish hereditary government never did, and never can, exist in any generation at any time whatever; that it is of the nature of treason; because it is an attempt to take away the rights of all the minors living at that time, and of all succeeding generations. It is of a degree beyond common treason. It is a sin against nature. The equal right of every generation is a right fixed in the nature of things. It belongs to the son when of age, as it belonged to the father before him.

"John Adams would himself deny the right that any former deceased generation could have to decree authoritatively a succession of governors over him, or over his children; and yet he assumes the pretended right, treasonable as it is, of acting it himself. His ignorance is his best excuse."

(See The Life and Works of Thomas Paine, Volume V, Patriot's Edition, page 148.)

And on page 151 Volume X of the same work Paine says:

"John Adams and Timothy Pickering were men whom nothing but the accidents of the times rendered visible on the political horizon. Elevation turned their heads, and public indignation has cast them to the ground. But an inquiry into the conduct and measures of that Administration is nevertheless necessary."

And on page 104 Paine wrote:

"But John Adams is a man of paradoxical heresies, and consequently of a bewildered mind. He wrote a book entitled "A Defense of the American Constitutions" and the principles of it are an attack upon them, but the book is descended to the tomb of forgetfulness, and the best fortune that can attend its author is quietly to follow its fate. John was not born for immortality."

The illustrations in this volume are as apposite as the "Statue of Liberty" in a work of Botany. One shows cotton workers at quitting time, another is that of navy destroyers in action, and a third shows strike breakers quitting under police protection.

Our author devotes pages to the discussions of Selfishness, Power, Selling Merchandise, etc.

Too bad he did not devote his talents to the life of a bigger character, John Quincy Adams, for example.

—BENJ. W. BURGER.

*This Man Adams, by Samuel McCoy. Brentano, New York City.

CORRESPONDENCE

FROM THE AUTHOR OF "THE ARDENT EIGHTIES"

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your review of "The Ardent Eighties" gave me a few thrilling moments. It gave me a better appreciation of my own modest effort, which I had undertaken, first, in order to relieve my mind of accumulated memories; and, secondly, to do justice to those ardent souls of the '80's who dared to make their dreams a reality, and who paid the usual price for their daring.

I thank you sincerely for your lines.
New York City

GREGORY WEINSTEIN.

URGES INCREASED ACTIVITY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The Georgeists in America are astonishingly *inactive* as compared with those in Great Britain, where the movement is making great headway; land-value taxation being frequently advocated in the House of Commons. There is an active club in every important city there, the members of which are steady letterwriters to the newspapers. A record kept for the past three months shows 70 known contributors of 138 letters and articles in newspapers in 27 towns, an average of ten letters a week.

In New Jersey it is a rare thing to see a letter on the subject in a newspaper, though all newspapers are open to letters from their readers.

To indicate the willingness of editors to print Site-value tax matter I would say that I am frequently asked by editors of prominent papers to write an article for them, which of course I do. Recently after writing one for the Camden *Courier*, which they backed up with an excellent editorial, the editor asked me to write half a dozen more such articles.

The greater the number of writers, the greater will be the apparent strength of public opinion wanting this legislation. Unfortunately, it now seems to be agreed by leading Georgeists that use of the term "Single Tax," against which there is a strong public prejudice, has kept back the movement. It is useless to advocate repeal of any tax unless also advocating shifting to site, or land-value, and stating the reason why.

In addition to letters to newspapers, it is important to interview political leaders and tax officials. Another important class is mayors, finance commissioners and public officials in general.

Newark, N. J.

ALFRED N. CHANDLER.

AGAINST THE NAME SINGLE TAX

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am very pleased over the signs of revolt against the continued use of the term "Single Tax" as applied to the movement which has heretofore gone under that name, particularly as expressed by Mr. J. C. Lincoln at the Chicago Convention.

There is an indirectness—almost a dishonesty—in the advocacy of a tax, even a single tax, at the same time that we aim to abolish all taxes. And Georgeists, of all people, can afford to be both direct and honest. They have nothing to hide and everything to be proud of.

We have two distinct aims in view. One is to have the entire rent of land appropriated to the use of the whole people who have created it. The other, and which is made possible by the first, is to stop the robbery involved in taxing for public use the values produced and belonging to the individual.

So far a short and suitable name has not been found for the first of these two objects. As the two are inseparably connected why not use the words which shortly and perfectly fit the second? One of the things which may be charged against the term now used is that it has nothing startling to a lazy mentality. "What is the good. We can't escape paying taxes anyway, whether many or single; They are going

to dig so much from us in any case. Let us go to sleep again." But Tax Abolition. Here is something to stir the blood. We want to know, and is there not a string to it? No, there is no string to it, and if you can avoid using land, directly or indirectly, which belongs to the public you will be free from paying either taxes or rent. And now that we have your attention we will show you how.

Sixty-five years ago Abolition won a great and notable victory. If we who are proud to be known as Georgeists will only "lay aside every weight which doth so easily beset us" we will make it easy for the next generation to achieve a more notable victory for black and white men alike.

Hamilton, Ontario

E. S. GILBERT.

ALSO VOICES HIS DISSENT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I wish to join those people who propose that the followers of Henry George leave off using the terms *Tax and Taxation* when they are speaking of *Rent* and the *Collection of Rent* (land rent, economic rent). Experience shows that those terms have always caused, and will always cause a great deal of misunderstanding and repulsion.

What Henry George really proposes is *no tax or taxation at all*.

I am perfectly aware that Henry George himself often used the terms "Single Tax" and "Taxation of Land Values," but, nevertheless, these terms are neither scientific nor suitable to the purpose. On the contrary, I am sure, too, that if Henry George had been able to foresee the horrible taxation plundering which has taken place after the great war, and is still growing worse and worse, he would have shunned every hint of that infamous system as having any resemblance whatever to the just system he proposed.

By the bye, it seems strange that Henry George in the first part of "Progress and Poverty," where his elaborate and precise definitions of economic terms are to be found, never uses the words *Tax and Taxation*, but is always speaking of *Rent* ("land rent," "the term rent in its economic sense" "the law of rent")—and then, later on, speaks of *Tax and Taxation* as signifying the same things. Of course, we Georgeists all know what he really means, but the use of these terms is inconsequent and misleading all the same.

Until some fifteen years ago we also here in Denmark used the wrong terms for the right thing; but since then, having been happy enough to find a good and pregnant term, we completely abandoned the words *Tax and Taxation* as having nothing to do with the ideals of Henry George. The term now current in Denmark is *Grundskyld*, which is something like *Ground-due*, t.e. the land rent or ground rent which is due to the community, or, in other words, the duty which every landholder is liable to pay to the community for holding his piece of land.

In spite of differences of opinion concerning some other more or less peripheric questions here, we are all united in the use of the term *Grundskyld*, and I dare say it is a good step forward as to clearness in our propaganda.

Finally I venture to admonish Georgeists all over the world. Pray, fellows, leave off using the terms *Tax and Taxation* when you are actually speaking of *Rent* and the *Collecting of Rent*, and try to find an appropriate and adequate name for the thing. The sooner this is accomplished, the better for our common cause.

Faxe Ladenplads, Denmark

P. LARSEN.

CONCERNING CONVENTION PROGRAMMES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The November-December issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM* has an editorial squib to the effect as follows:

"The *Square Deal* of Toronto, Canada, 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."

The trouble, dear editor, is that we never do learn by experience. The *Square Deal's* complaint would hold good for almost every con-

vention, conference, congress . . . whatever you want to call them, that we have ever arranged. The programme for each session is so overfull, that, even if speakers keep to their schedule, which they seldom do, there is so little time left that any discussion however valuable, started by a speech, must be cut off by the Chairman with a reference to the passage of time . . . "we must get through our programme."

Now, with the exception of the banquet, and the one evening public meeting which are part of each convention, the discussion is the most valuable part of any session where we are among ourselves, or where our visitors are the intelligent public which wants to find out what it is we advocate. Any set talk at these meetings should, and usually does, concern phases of the movements in different parts of the country, or of the world; and questions, or discussion, following that talk will be of more value than some other talk switching off to some other phase, confusing the mind by a scattering of thought-foci. To ourselves, as to any stranger in our midst, searching honestly for the truth we have to offer, such a session with say just one or at most two talks, if possible somehow connected by locality or subject, and followed by an exhaustive discussion of that particular subject, would be of much greater enlightenment and value than the crowded "ragout" programmes.

And far too little time is left for the sessions on Resolutions, on our attitude towards any important political action or movement of the day.

Each time we sin anew. I can remember, in the days when I helped arrange dinners, conventions, meetings of all kinds, that invariably, when I, or some kindred soul, tried to keep the programme shorter, simpler, more coherent, there was the objection. . . . "You haven't enough on your programme to attract the public." I did not believe in this idea, but had to give in frequently. If one may concede—I do not say that I do but others may—that the objection would hold good in case of a public dinner or public mass meeting, I certainly refuse to accept it for a moment, when it is a case of the morning or afternoon intimate sessions of a convention.

If we could just remember these things when making up the programmes, not editorialize about them afterwards, there would not be so much grumbling among those who do much for the Cause, and go hopefully to each convention in search of intelligent discussion that will be of aid in the individual's problems.

For public meetings. . . no. Personally, the usual rambling discussion by the G. P. bores me as greatly as do the overlong programmes. But in our more intimate sessions let us cut out the hash and the entrees and give one, or at most two solid dishes to chew over!

New Canaan, Conn.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

DURING January James R. Brown confined his lecture work to New York and New Jersey. During February about thirty lectures have been arranged for and will include Carnegie Institute of Technology, University of Pittsburgh, and the Pennsylvania College of Women and the Susquehanna University.

THE Indiana University Library, Bloomington, Ind., is in need of No. 6, Vol. 27 of *LAND AND FREEDOM*.

JAMES B. ELLERY, of Eric, Pa., contributes a well written letter on the Briand-Kellogg Treaty to the *Erie Dispatch-Herald*.

WE acknowledge with grateful appreciation receipt of the New York Red Book published by J. B. Lyon of Albany, and edited by our old friend James Malcolm. This very useful book, of which Mr. Malcolm has been the editor for many years, contains the very latest information of how the business of ten million people is carried on, and includes bills signed by the governor, bills favored by the governor and defeated

by the Legislature, portraits of the Legislative Correspondents, members of the Senate and Assembly, matters concerning agriculture, health, labor, education, civil service, charities, etc. The book is indispensable in a newspaper office, for there are few subjects concerning the administration of the state's affairs for which the seeker for information will look in vain.

WILLIAM D. TATE, of Oak Park, Ill., renewing his subscription, writes: "LAND AND FREEDOM is the best paper since the *Public* of the earlier period."

WE learn of the death of Edmund Norton at Los Angeles in his 70th year. His death followed on a severe operation. Mr. Norton was born in New York City, taught school in his native state, later drifted to the northwest and became superintendent of the Siletz Indian reservation in Oregon. Later he became well known in the Liberal movements of California and was associated with John Steven McGroarty in the publication of the *West Coast Magazine*. He was an active worker for the cause and lectured and wrote indefatigably in defence of our principles. His correspondence with this paper covered many years, and his services to the cause, zealous, whole-hearted and continuous, entitle him to rank high among the departed leaders who have helped the world's advance.

THE *Fairhope Courier*, of Nov. 27, contains an interesting sketch and a speaking portrait of Frank Stephens. It also prints a graceful poem of Frank's suitable for the Xmas season which moves us to wish that he tried his hand oftener at verse writing.

In the *New Republic* for Dec. 12, William A. Black, of San Antonio, Texas, has a communication on Tariffs and Land Prices. We are glad also to note that William J. Lee, of Stanford, Conn., once active in various ways in the movement, is again in evidence as a writer of Single Tax letters to the press. We note the names also of Julian Hickok, editor of the *Commonwealth*, of Philadelphia, to a Single Tax communication to the *Ledger* of that city and that of Harold Sudell, on Subway Benefits, in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*. M. Van Veen and George Lloyd of this city set the pace in letter writing to the newspapers hereabouts and their communications are pithy and to the point.

ABOUT thirty men and women of the movement in New York and vicinity made a very pleasant occasion of the farewell dinner to Mr. and Mrs. Matthew Warriner, of England, on the eve of their departure from this country. The dinner was held at Henry's in Fulton Street, this city, and was presided over by Lawrence Tracy as Toastmaster with his usual grace and dignity. Mr. Bolton Hall opened the speech making, which was delightfully informal, and was followed by Messrs. Geiger, Boulton, Lloyd, Macauley, Miller, Goeller, Van Veen, Miss Schetter and others. Mr. Warriner made an interesting talk, and his parting injunction was that we get on the ballot wherever possible. He gave high praise to his colleagues in the British Commonwealth Land Party and paid his respects to the politicians of the Liberal and Labor parties who seek to compromise on the land question. The meeting broke up reluctantly and all those present shared in the good wishes extended to our charming guests who have endeared themselves to all Georgians by their natural and simple bearing and devotion to the principles to which they have given their lives.

WE learn from *Progress*, of Melbourne, Australia, that Mr. H. A. Pitt, Under Treasurer for Victoria, advocating an increased tax on unimproved land value for the cost of railroad construction, says that the values due to the provision of railway transportation must at least equal the cost of construction. He says that "the railways are really run at a financial loss for the benefit of land owners."

OUR old friend, C. F. Nesbit, of Washington, D. C., long a worker in the cause, has been severely ill, but our friends will be glad to know that he is now on the high road to recovery.

J. B. MCGAURAN, of Denver, Colorado, in renewing his subscription, writes: "LAND AND FREEDOM is excellent—better than good."

J. W. GRAHAM PEACE, of the *Commonweal*, London, England, informs us that the Warriners, of whom pleasant recollections will long be entertained, have returned safely to English shores, pleased and encouraged at the reception from the many friends on this side of the water.

WE regret to chronicle the death of R. B. Blakemore, of Fargo, North Dakota, on October 12 after a week's illness. Mr. Blakemore was born in Hopkinsville, Ky., in 1866, and for some years represented the Scottish American and Edinburgh Mortgage Companies at Fargo. Through one of his clerks he became interested in the Single Tax. He was a great student of Henry George and a contributor to the activities of the movement. He had been a reader of LAND AND FREEDOM for many years. He attended the Henry George Congress in New York in the Autumn of 1927.

JAMES HENLE has resigned as managing editor of *McCall's Magazine* to become president of the Vanguard Press. Jacob Baker, identified with this publishing house from its beginning, remains as vice president and director.

THE *New York Sun*, of Nov. 27, under the heading, "American Farmers Move into Canada—Cheap Land and Single Tax Draw Many Settlers," quotes from the report of the National Resource Department of the Canadian Railways and gives figures of increased farm settlement in the Canadian Northwest. An inquiry addressed by LAND AND FREEDOM to the Canadian Railway headquarters at Montreal was answered by the Director of the Resource Department to the effect that they were unable to locate any such reference in the Report. So the mystery of the *Sun's* title head remains unsolved.

F. A. NEIDIG, of Muscatine, Iowa, a book store man of that city and for many years an adherent of our philosophy, died recently after a brief illness.

Prof. John Dewey, having been elected a member of the Advisory Committee of the Henry George Foundation, writes as follows to Secretary Williams: "It gives me great pleasure to accept the election to membership on your Advisory Committee." The officers of the Foundation are much gratified that Dr. Dewey has so readily and unquestionably affiliated himself with the Foundation.

THE *Commonwealth*, published at Ardmore, Pa., by John W. Dix and edited by Julian P. Hickok, Charles J. Schoales and Frederick E. Meyer, presents with its November number a very interesting discussion of current problems in the light of our philosophy. The articles are arresting and well written.

M. P. SHIEL, well known English novelist, two of whose books, written some years ago, "The Purple Cloud" and the "Lords of the Sea," were unmistakably influenced by the social philosophy of Henry George, has written a detective story, "How the Old Woman Got Home," which Harry Hansen, literary critic of the *New York World*, calls the best detective story in years. Mr. Hansen says, "Who M. P. Shiel is I do not know." Mr. Hansen was promptly informed by several correspondents among whom was the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM to whose communications Mr. Hansen gave space in his column.

J. A. VYNE, of Camp Verde, Arizona, and his wife have both been with the flu and the copy of the *Arizona Single Taxer* now before us has been somewhat delayed.

MRS. ANNA GEORGE DEMILLE, daughter of Henry George, visited Fairhope in December. Mr. E. Yancey Cohen and Mr. Albert Schalkenbach welcomed her at Mobile and motored her to Fairhope. There was an informal reception tendered her by Mr. and Mrs. Cohen at their charming home on the colony bay front. Speeches were made welcoming the distinguished guest by L. O. Bishop, Albert Schalkenbach and John Emery McLean.

EDWARD WHITE is contributing articles on the transit situation to the *Kansas City Labor News*. These articles are vigorously written in combat the demand for a ten cent fare asked for by the transit companies. Mr. White shows that the street railway system is operating at a cost of less than six cents a passenger, and contends that the ten cents asked for is for the purpose of capitalizing net earnings and thus sending forty million dollars to the stock market securities.

CLAYTON J. EWING, of Chicago, is beginning to work up some enthusiasm for a new Single Tax enclave in the Mississippi Valley not more than four hundred miles from Chicago, and hopes to get the project under way in a year or two.

ABOUT 2,000,000 households in the Ukraine will be freed of taxation and 5,200,000 rubles expended for agricultural improvements.

GENERAL JOHNSON says that the owners of lands needed by the government for the Bonnet Carre flooding above New Orleans are asking ten times the assessed value of their properties. Well, what are you going to do about it?

WE welcome the *Chicago Single Taxer* issued by the group of young people from whom so much is beginning to be expected. This issue contains many interesting items and an account of the visit to the International Aeronautical Exposition at Chicago of Mr. and Mrs. Spencer Heath, of Baltimore, Md., former residents of Chicago. Mr. Heath was president of the Chicago Single Tax Club in 1899.

Land and Liberty, of London, England, announces the passing of Alexander Ure (Lord Strathclyde) former Solicitor-General of Scotland under Sir. Campbell-Bannerman's administration. A bill for the taxation of land values promoted by the Glasgow corporation found in Alexander Ure an earnest and well-equipped advocate. He helped prepare the 1909 Budget and was an uncompromising foe of landlordism. He was well informed as to the theory and practice of land value taxation. He spoke wholly without notes, winning audiences by his persuasive eloquence.

CHARLES LEBARON GOELLER gave a lecture on the political economy of Henry George before the economic class at Tufts College in Boston on January 8, and at the Labor Temple in this city on January 10; also later at the Exchange Club, of Endicott, N. Y. Mr. Goeller has delivered a number of lectures before church clubs in Binghamton and vicinity with addresses in other places including a largely attended meeting at the Susquehanna, Pa., High School. These lectures are illustrated with lantern slides that hold the attention and have received much favorable comment. Mr. Goeller received good press publicity in some of the towns visited. Lectures have been arranged for during the Spring months at Elmira, Rensselaer and Vassar College. While in New York Mr. Goeller spoke also to a gathering of the friends of Miss Charlotte Schetter at her studio, 3 University Place and faced a highly critical audience.

THE week beginning January 20 has been a busy one for George Lloyd, but perhaps not an unusually busy one, since there are few men in the movement more active in the work. On Tuesday he spoke before the Modern Culture Club in the Bronx and on Friday at the forum in the Morris High School, Bronx, and on the Sunday at a Socialist party gathering at 1167 Boston Road. On Thursday, January 25, he appeared before the Labor Temple and Saturday night filled the engagement arranged for Oscar Geiger at Dr. Reiss' church 4th Avenue and 20th Street, Mr. Geiger having been taken suddenly ill. Nor should we omit mention of the fact that as usual Mr. Lloyd spoke on the radio Saturday afternoon. It was a pretty full week at that for our yeoman worker.

THE Freeland Club holds regular monthly meetings in Los Angeles, California. Mr. Abraham Schomer was the speaker on January 19, his subject being, "The Primary Cause of War."

GEORGE E. EVANS, President of the Henry George Foundation, has been abroad for several weeks, visiting Northern Africa and Italy on his present tour.

RAY STANNARD BAKER in his "Life and Letters of Woodrow Wilson," tells of Wilson's meeting with William S. U'Ren, whom he speaks of as "a devoted follower of Henry George, a blacksmith turned lawyer, with a genius for organization and persuasion."

JUDGE EDWARD BURDICK presided at a dinner on January 21 at the Cosmopolitan Hotel in Denver at which a number present were called together to ask the question, "Will the Single Tax insure Prosperity and solve the problem of the Unemployed?"

OUR readers will be sorry to learn of the death of Mrs. Eleanor B. Ingersoll, wife of Charles H. Ingersoll known wherever the Single Tax is known. She died after a six week's illness at the home of her daughter Mrs. Joseph D. Scheerer, of Llewellyn Park, West Orange, N. J.

WE have received from the Henry George Iron Works at Milk River, Alberta, Canada, a variation of the so-called "15 Puzzle," popular a number of years ago. It consists of certain wooden blocks to be placed in position. Mr. Tom. Fohr is proprietor of the Henry George Iron Works and this is designed as an advertisement of his flourishing industry at Milk River.

PROF. HARRY GUNNISON BROWN, of Columbia University, Columbia, Mo., author of "Significant Extracts from Progress and Poverty," having been appealed to by the publishers for an article for the *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics* (of which Prof. Ely is the head) contributes to the November number of that periodical a very full discussion of the question, "Should Bare Land Values be Taxed More Heavily?" Such an article in such a periodical read by the people who are bound to read it must do a lot of good.

WITH the issue of January 5 our esteemed contemporary the *Commonweal*, of London, enters the tenth year of publication. The paper renews its vows to serve the great cause, which is the immediate restoration to mankind of the land which is their birthright. Success to our brilliant contemporary.

IN December there was unveiled at Woodlawn Cemetery, N. Y., a monument to Dr. Edward McGlynn with appropriate exercises. The monument was erected by the McGlynn Association which has maintained itself since the Anti-Poverty days.