

May—June, 1929

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Henry George and Modern
Philosophic Thought

Address by Professor George Geiger

Land Ownership—Its Use and Abuse

W. B. Northrop

Death of W. B. Northrop

John Filmer

Cebelia L'Hommedieu

The Coming Edinburgh and
Pittsburgh Meetings

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.

MAY—JUNE, 1929

VOL. XXIX

No. 3. WHOLE No. 154

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse 11, 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.....	67
COMING INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE AT EDINBURGH, JULY 29	69
ANOTHER ROYAL ADVOCATE OF OUR PRINCIPLES.....	70
A NOTABLE ENDORSEMENT FROM PHILIP SNOWDEN .	70
JOHN FILMER.....Cebelia L'Hommedieu	71
INDUSTRIAL ECONOMICS.....Percy R. Meggy	73
LAND OWNING—ITS USE AND ABUSE...W. B. Northrop	74
DEATH OF W. B. NORTHROP.....	77
ADDRESS OF PROF. GEORGE GEIGER	78
LECTURE ITINERARY OF CHAS. LEBARON GOELLER .	82
FAREWELL DINNER TO PROF. F. W. ROMAN	83
OREGON.....	83
THE COMING HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS.....	85
TOLSTOY AND HIS WORK. ADDRESS.. Chas. G. Baldwin	88
BOOK NOTES.....	91
CORRESPONDENCE.....	92
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	95

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

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

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

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

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

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

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXIX

MAY—JUNE, 1929

No. 3

Comment and Reflection

WE commend to the attention of Mr. Green, head of the American Federation of Labor, the following from a pamphlet published in 1671, entitled "Reasons for Suppressing Stage Coaches." The argument is so much in line with Mr. Green's well-known convictions regarding machines and labor-saving devices that we are sure if he had been living at that time he would have heartily endorsed it, since, as is so admirably stated, the coming of the stage coach—an improved machine in effect—tended to decrease the demands for swords, pistols, holsters, portmanteaus, etc., and thus throw the makers of these things out of employment, or so Mr. Green would have argued in the curious topsy-turviness of his economics:

Most gentlemen, before they travelled in coaches, used to ride with swords, pistols, holsters, portmanteaus and hat cases, which in these coaches they have little or no use for; for, when they rode on horseback, they rode in one suit and carried another to wear when they came to their journey's end, or lay by the way; but in coaches a silk hat and an India gown, with sash, silk stockings and beaver hats, men ride in, and carry no other with them, because they escape the wet and dirt, which on horseback they cannot avoid; whereas in two or three journeys on horseback their clothes and hats were wont to be spoiled; which done, they were forced to have new ones very often, and that increased the consumption of the manufacturers and the employment of the manufacturers; which travelling in coaches doth in no way do.

ARMAMENTS, wars and rumors of wars can be traced in large part to economic maladjustments. But it is interesting to note that Prof. Salvador de Madariago in his recent book entitled "Disarmament," published by Coward-McCann of this city (an admirable treatment of the subject by the way) curiously but no less pertinently reverses the order of sequence and argues that armaments tend to encourage "Artificial Economic Systems by lending some plausibility to the theory that a nation must be self-supporting." The world is deterred "from pursuing its occupations in all peace of mind," and the Professor finely adds that "the realm of the human spirit is defaced by a permanent blot." There is no doubt that cause and effect act and react in the way the Professor describes.

THE *Southern Agriculturist* published in Nashville, Tenn., in a recent issue thus solemnly treats of "equality of opportunity"—not knowing of course what it means:

There is no such thing possible as equality of opportunity. In the first place, nobody knows what a good opportunity is, and no one can tell the difference between a good opportunity and a poor opportunity.

THEN to show that he does not know what he is talking about the editor proceeds. "It is impossible to standardize human beings." Even President Hoover would not be guilty of such confusion. Men and women are unequally endowed with genius and capacity, but they are handicapped by exterior influences and obstacles created by a system of privilege. So it often happens that they are out-distanced in the race by the immeasurably less endowed. As for the masses of men who are not exceptionally endowed, the so-called plain people, who are nevertheless quite capable of making a living and going through life as fairly prosperous men and women, find the earth shut against them. The great reservoir of the planet, all its choice spots have been preempted.

IN addition the great army of those who do the work of the world, who provide everything we call wealth, find that there is a subtle influence at work that drains their resources, levies continuous tribute upon their earnings, a tribute which goes in an endless stream into the pockets of those who as landlords or intermediaries, do nothing to create this wealth, but who are mere tribute takers. We are told that everybody works in this country. That is not true. Everybody is *busy*, but work in the economic sense is the making of wealth. Landlords and their underlings, real estate agents, collectors of rent, land speculators, are all as active as squirrels in a cage—with just as many futile revolutions—but they are not workers like house-builders, manufacturers, store-keepers and business men generally.

THERE is no "equality of opportunity," dear sapient editors of the *Southern Agriculturist*, where land is a medium of speculation, and where the enormous values that attach to it, and which are created by the presence of population and their private and public activities, go into private pockets. And real equality of opportunity can only come when our prevailing economic institutions are overthrown, and we establish a system in which the highly gifted Thomas Edison, John D. Rockefeller, John Jacob Astor and plain John Smith will secure their relative positions in a race that shall be fairly run.

PROF. RICHARD T. ELY now threatens to classify land as property in all succeeding instruction. This "threat" is contained in a communication to an inquirer in which the Professor says: "This will be brought out in the new edition of "Outlines and Economics." To which we may retort that Prof. Ely may also if he wishes classify as capital the fructifying influences of the sun. But that will not make them so. This he will not do because they are not property and cannot be rented. But if they could be, the Ely school of economics would at once include them as capital and as something to be paid for to private individuals.

IN this same letter occurs the following:

"It seems to me that if you will reflect upon what you see about you you will find unearned increment everywhere, using the terms as they are ordinarily employed. The chance gains are especially significant items in the class of unearned increment. In fact, W. I. King thinks that these are the only unearned increments; it all depends on your definition."

We do not know this man King, but he too must be a genius in his way. Well-a-day! the only unearned increments are the chance gains, the winnings in the stock market, or on the race tracks, lotteries and gambling halls. If anything were needed to make the prevailing political economy utterly ridiculous Mr. King has added the finishing touch.

THE muddle that President Hoover and the legislators at Washington have got themselves into is illustrative of the topsy-turvyiness of prevailing economic theories. Reference is here had to the farm problem. The equalization fee has now been definitely abandoned in favor of the debenture plan, which provides that the exporters of staple farm products, wheat, cotton and other agricultural products which admittedly cannot be increased by the tariff, shall receive from the government debentures equivalent to half the protective duty on what they sell. These debentures will be accepted in payment of import duties, and the benefits of protection, which they now confess cannot be equalized as between agriculture and manufacturing, will at last be accorded to the farmer.

AND President Hoover, after his fine words against government going into business, now finds himself up to his neck in business. President Coolidge was more fortunate. He was able to get along without saying or doing much. Four years of "masterly inactivity" made the president a political recluse. President Hoover is not so lucky. Although Hoover, no more than Coolidge, has not as yet identified himself with any constructive policy, he will find, now that he has definitely rejected the debenture plan (and even before this copy of LAND AND FREEDOM reaches its readers may have vetoed it), he must announce himself in favor of some plan of farm relief. The

inevitable cannot be staved off any longer. In adopting any plan he will antagonize elements in and out of his party.

IT is useless to appeal to President Hoover with any intelligent plan. He is an able engineer, but he has already revealed a white background on which nothing is written relating to government. On that white space he has yet to trace a single clear-cut conviction, a single apprehension of anything fundamental. He is "internationally minded," we are told. If this refers to his sympathies we have no reason to question it. But one may travel to and fro on the earth without at all divining the relations of peoples to one another. He sees the world divided into sections by tariff barriers, as if there were hostile interests among peoples who reach out to exchange their products with one another. He does not see in our unrestricted private property in land a conflict between the privileged and unprivileged interests that is inevitable. President Hoover does not divine the origin of this struggle. He accepts it all as part of the order of things. No man can be internationally minded and not be aware of something at least that lies beneath this endless conflict between the oppressed and the system that oppresses them.

JUST as political economy today concerns itself with what is termed economics and includes business management, agriculture, mining, and a variety of unrelated subjects, wholly ignoring the problem of the distribution of wealth and the laws that govern it, so sociology has passed into discussions of "behaviorism"—the new fad—and the treatment of fractional problems and narrow specializations. There is little social thinking because none of those who are immersed in these detached and fractional speculations have any social theory at all. The plight they find themselves in, and of which they are of course wholly unconscious, is due to the abandonment of any theory of laws determining production and distribution.

NEITHER in the teachings of political economy nor in that of sociology are there any broad generalizations. Generalizations require hard thinking to formulate and much hard thinking to defend. Nor can we look for broad generalizations in an atmosphere where fractional problems seem alone to count. Nor can we hope for such generalizations where authority is cited to rebuke the student or professor who is tempted into unbeaten paths. And all this suffocating influence will account for piecemeal thinking and fractional speculations.

HOW can one discuss intelligently the problems of unemployment, business depression, tariffs, et al without a knowledge of and reference to certain fundamental natural laws? How discuss in any rational way

the problems of unemployment without references to man's relation to the earth, the natural resources from which all sustenance must be drawn? How attempt to determine the causes of bad times without a knowledge of what is property and the consequences of the legal treatment of things we call property? How discuss monopoly without some conception of the natural laws of society, the apprehension that somewhere distribution is interfered with, that monopoly must originate in obstructions to freedom?

WE are more and more reconciled to the great disparity in wages between college professors and bricklayers. But let us be perfectly fair and add that, in view of the experience of our friends Walter Fairchild and Chas. LeBaron Goeller, there are shining exceptions among professors of economics. It is impossible to speak in terms of unqualified disrespect of a class of teachers that includes such men as Prof. John Dewey, Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown, Prof. F. W. Roman, and others who might be named, and to recall these names may well soften the asperities which are provoked by the attitude of so many of the professors of economics.

A Professor's View

IF a man saves and improves his property, he must pay more taxes. If he is lazy and thriftless his taxes remain low. If, constructing a great factory, he increases the efficiency of hundreds of thousands of workmen and so adds to the sum of commodities which all may enjoy, he is punished by increased taxes.

But if, instead, he keeps a piece of land vacant and unused until the activities around him and the growth and development of the community have given it high value; if he then makes money out of what these others have done, requiring the person who would use the land to pay him a high price for advantages of situation for which not his activities but the activities of others are responsible: we keep his taxes low.

And this we do notwithstanding the fact that such holding of land out of use amounts to a public nuisance. For, because of it, gas pipes, electric light and telephone wires must be extended farther, street railway lines must run longer distances, retail store delivery service must cover larger area, and pedestrians must walk longer distances to and from their work; yet the holding of land out of use for speculative gains tends to make land dearer rather than cheaper, so that the individual householder may have somewhat less garden space than otherwise.

—PROF. HARRY GUNNISON BROWN, Department of Economics, University of Missouri.

International Conference July 29 at Edinburgh

THE draft of the program for the Fourth International Conference to Promote Land Value Taxation and Free Trade to be held at Edinburgh, Scotland, in the week commencing July 29th has been completed by the committee of which Mr. Ashley Mitchell of Great Britain is chairman. The opening of the session will not begin until Monday afternoon, July 29th, when Bailie Peter Burt, Chairman of the Arrangements Committee, will formally welcome the Conference to Scotland. There will be, it is stated, a social gathering on the preceding Saturday evening, and an informal program on Sunday for the early arrivals. The formal address of President Charles O'Connor Hennessy of New York will follow the address of Chairman Burt, and this will be followed by short speeches from representatives of various countries represented.

The following days will be taken up chiefly by discussions relative to various formal addresses which have been prepared on such subjects as "Free Trade in Its Fullness;" "World Competition and World Markets;" "Foreign Exchanges and International Trade;" "Economic Rent—The Dividing Line Between Common and Private Property;" "Land Valuation—Methods and Results." This latter subject will be a symposium of papers from Denmark, the United States, Australia, Hungary, and other countries. Discussion on these papers will, incidentally, deal with the question of whether selling value or annual economic rent should be the basis of taxes. Other papers will cover aspects of the land question in various countries under such titles as "Public Lands in German Communities;" "The Expropriation and Subdivision of Great Estates in Eastern Europe;" "The Victory of Georgeism in Denmark;" "Typical Objections Met and Answered."

A review of the progress of land value taxation in the United States since the publication of "Progress and Poverty" fifty years ago is to be undertaken by John J. Murphy of New York. One of the most humanly interesting and significant papers will be prepared by Chester C. Platt, dealing with the land boom in Florida and its social and economic effects, with incidental references to the curious taxation system by which Florida represses the growth of business and industry.

One of the desirable features of the Conference that the Arrangements Committee has provided is the printing in advance of all formal papers, which will not be read through at the Conference, but will be summarized in brief talks by their authors. The widest latitude will then be allowed for inquiry and discussion.

The local committees have provided various entertainments and sightseeing trips for the visitors, and on the evening of Tuesday, July 31st, there will be a social gathering for the celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Publication of "Progress and Poverty," at which a special

guest of the occasion will be Mrs. Anna George deMille. A garden party at the beautiful estate of Sir Henry and Lady Ballantyne will be one of the entertainment features.

Among the Americans who have booked passage for the Conference are Mrs. Anna George deMille, Miss Margaret deMille and Miss Agnes deMille, Charles O'Connor Hennessy, John J. Murphy, Mr. and Mrs. Otto Cullman and their daughter and nephew, George E. Evans and daughter, Walter Fairchild, Mr. and Mrs. Chester C. Platt, Mr. and Mrs. Charles G. Baldwin, Dr. and Mrs. Mark Milliken, Dr. Herbert Bigelow, Miss Antoinette Kaufmann, Miss Frances I. Wolf, Mr. and Mrs. Byron Holt, Mr. and Mrs. Charles R. Eckert, Mr. Allan C. Thompson, Miss Jennie Rogers, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew P. Canning and son, Miss DuBois and Mrs. Amalia DuBois, Mr. Robert Scott and others.

The closing event of the Conference as at present planned, will be a Sunday night meeting in the large hall of the United Free Church where addresses are to be made to accentuate the ethical and religious aspects of the social philosophy of Henry George. Different religious denominations will be represented on the platform. Rev. Herbert Bigelow of Cincinnati will make one of the addresses, and Rabbi Wise of New York has promised to endeavor to attend and speak. Professor John Dewey, who is lecturing at Edinburgh this summer, has been invited to speak at the Conference. The Danish Henry George League has also invited him to speak at Copenhagen before he returns to New York.

As announced in a previous issue Chester C. Platt, editor of the *Batavia (N. Y.) Times* will report the proceedings of the Conference for LAND AND FREEDOM.

Another Royal Advocate Of Our Principles

PRINCESS ALICE of Greece, whose statement favoring the Single Tax was published in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, is not the first member of the British royal family to perceive the benefits that would follow a practical application of Henry George's ideas.

In the year 1884, the Prince of Wales (son of Queen Victoria and afterwards King Edward VII) was a member of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, and signed without dissent the Report which contained the following remarks on the "rating" (or what in the United States would be referred to as the local taxation) of vacant land. Another of the signers was Cardinal Manning. The Marquess of Salisbury and two others of the seventeen members dissented from this recommendation:

"Your Majesty's Commissioners must observe in reference to Lord Shaftesbury's Acts, and to nearly every proposal for improving the dwellings of the working classes as well as to other local improvements, that the present incidence of local taxation stands seriously in the way of all

progress and reform. They do not feel that they are authorized by the terms of Your Majesty's Commission to go generally into the question of local taxation, but they are of opinion that until some reform is introduced which shall secure contribution to local expenditure from other sources of income received by residents in the locality, in addition to the present rateable property, no great progress can be made in local improvements."

"In connection with any such general consideration of the law of rating attention would have to be given to the following facts. At present, land available for building in the neighborhood of our populace centres, though its capital value is very great, is probably producing a small yearly return until it is let for building. The owners of this land are not rated in relation to real value but to the actual annual income. They can thus afford to keep their land out of the market, and to part with only small quantities so as to raise the price beyond the natural monopoly price which the land would command by its advantages of position. Meantime, the general expenditure of the town on improvements is increasing the value of their property. If this land were rated at, say, 4 per cent on its selling value, the owners would have a more direct incentive to part with it to those who are desirous of building, and a two-fold advantage would result to the community. First, all the valuable property would contribute to the rates, and thus the burden on the occupiers would be diminished by the increase in the rateable property. Secondly, the owners of the building land would be forced to offer their land for sale, and thus their competition with one another would bring down the price of building land, and so diminish the tax in the shape of ground rent, or price paid for land which is now levied on urban enterprise by the adjacent landowners, a tax be it remembered which is no recompense for any industry or expenditure on their part, but is the natural result of the industry and activity of the townspeople themselves. Your Majesty's Commissioners would recommend that these matters should be included in legislation when the law of rating comes to be dealt with by Parliament."

A Notable Endorsement

FOREWORD TO THE NEW ABRIDGED EDITION
OF PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE (LONDON)
BY RT. HON. PHILIP SNOWDEN, M. P.

I AM pleased to have the opportunity of writing a few words of introduction to this abridged edition of Henry George's great work on Free Trade.

Two generations ago the great controversy of Free Trade and Protection was fought out in Great Britain, and so decisive was the victory for Free Trade that Disrael declared Protection to be "dead and damned."

A new generation has arisen which knows nothing from painful experience of the sufferings which Protection inflicted upon the working classes. Because the limited application of Free Trade principles has not removed all social and industrial hardships there is a disposition in some quarters to deny its achievements and advantages, and to revert to a fiscal system which has been discredited by all practical experience.

Each new generation has in a large measure to re-learn the truths which its ancestors established by discussion and practical experience. Free Traders have been so confident in the fundamental soundness of their faith, and in the security of the system, that they have neglected to keep the rising generation well grounded in the principles of the faith.

The case for Protection can be presented with great plausibility. It makes its appeal to the selfish interests of particular individuals and classes. Free Trade, on the other hand, makes its appeal to the wider welfare of the whole community.

Now that one of the great political parties in Great Britain has again definitely adopted Protection as its policy, it is vitally necessary that the case for Free Trade should be presented in a popular form. It is not enough to confine the controversy between Free Trade and Protection to disputes as to whether a tariff has benefited or injured some particular industry.

No Free Trader has ever asserted that Protection would never in any circumstances benefit an industry to which it may be applied. But Free Traders do assert that whatever advantage an industry may derive from Protection is gained by a more than corresponding loss to the community generally.

To appreciate that truth one needs to be well grounded in the fundamental principles of international trade. With that knowledge the fallacies of the Protectionists are easily detected.

This work by Henry George gets down to the fundamentals of the controversy. It is at the same time the most popular and most scientific exposition of the subject which has ever been written. A student of the question, equipped with the arguments of this book, is qualified to put out the plausibilities and pretensions of the Protectionists.

The reader of this treatise will learn that Free Trade is a principle of far wider significance and application than a question of tariffs on imports only. Even in the narrower sense in which the Free Trade issue figures in political controversy it is a matter of the greatest importance to industry and to the working classes. Protection is the foster-mother of monopoly, and monopoly in all its forms when enjoyed by individuals is the robbery of the community for the benefit of private interests.

The publication of this cheap, abridged edition of Henry George's masterpiece is rendering a great public service, and I earnestly commend its study to all who want to get a thorough grasp of the basic elementary facts of the case for Free Trade.

FIND this vast network, which you call property extended over the whole planet. I can not occupy the bleakest crag of the White Hills or the Alleghany Range, but some man or corporation steps up to me to show me that it is his. Now, though I am very peaceable, and on

my private account could well enough die, since it appears that there was some mistake in my creation, and that I have been missent to this earth, where all the seats were already taken,—yet I feel called upon in behalf of rational nature, which I represent, to declare to you my opinion, that if the Earth is yours, so also is it mine. All your aggregate existences are less to me a fact than is my own; as I am born to the earth, so the Earth is given to me, what I want of it to till and to plant—I must tell you the truth practically; and take that which you call yours. It is God's world and mine; yours as much as you want, mine as much as I want.

—RALPH WALDO EMERSON in lecture delivered in Boston, Dec. 7, 1841.

John Filmer

JOHN FILMER, born in London, Eng., January 12th, 1837, celebrated his ninety-second birthday anniversary this year with a few friends at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Beggs in Brooklyn, N. Y. Twelve days later pneumonia rendered his body beyond further use to him and he passed to the world of spirits on January 27th, 1929. His wife, Alice Lockett-Filmer, had preceded him to the higher life on July 4th, 1907. Two children remain, Walter Filmer of Chicago and Mrs. Marion Cloke of Brooklyn.

Mr. Filmer was brought up in the Church of England and was educated in a Church School conducted by an uncle, a clergyman of that church. At the age of fifteen, with an elder brother, he came to America where two other brothers and a sister had preceded them to the new country. Here the family attended the Episcopal Church, and for a time, young John followed their custom. But, being of an inquiring mind, he soon, with a friend, James Lockett, decided to attend other church services in quest of answers to such problems as had come to them in their thinking.

One Sunday they found their way into the Bowdoin Street Church of the New Jerusalem, in Boston, Mass. On leaving the church they mutually agreed they had "wondered what that man was preaching about," and, apparently, thereafter, "forgot all about it." One day, however, Mr. Lockett acquired a second-hand copy of "Nobel's Appeal" which the two young men studied with much interest. Thereafter they decided they would go again to the church on Bowdoin Street and make acquaintance with its minister. This led to an intimate and valued friendship with the Rev. Thomas Worcester, and in 1858 James and Alice Lockett and John Filmer affiliated themselves with the Boston New Church. Mr. Filmer and Miss Lockett were married there by the Rev. Worcester the next year.

The Massachusetts New Church Union was organized in 1860 with both these young men among the charter members.

In 1861 the Filmers moved to Brooklyn, N. Y. and subsequently became members of the Brooklyn Society of the New Church. The Rev. James E. Mills was pastor of this young society then, and its place of worship was in a room rented for the purpose. Mr. and Mrs. Filmer joined heartily in the activities of the society, both in church and Sunday School work. Mr. Filmer was also among the charter members of the New York Association of the New Church when that organization came into being. He served for several years as its secretary, and except for two years while living in the west never missed a meeting. He was the last of its charter members at the time of his death. Also he was a life member of the Swedenborg Foundation, formerly the American Swedenborg Printing and Publishing Society.

Mr. Filmer was devoted to art, and in his early life followed the occupation of wood engraver. Many of the illustrations in Webster's Dictionary are the work of his hand.

In 1884, the Superintendent of the Brooklyn Sunday School, Mr. Wilmarth, gave him a copy of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty." This Mr. Filmer studied with great care. He found in the Georgian theory a correlation with the writings of Swedenborg, and this decided him to concentrate his future studies on these two great teachers. To this end he perfected his knowledge of Latin wherewith he could read Swedenborg in the original for more thorough understanding. In Swedenborg's "Divine Providence" he found certain passages which corroborate the basic principles of Henry George's theory of a site-value taxation for the use of land as the *only just tax* which any government may impose.

Mr. Filmer became inspired with the idea that this truth should have more emphasis in the teachings of the New Church—and that it constituted a vital link between the spiritual and the earth life of the Church, and that it was this lack of an essential which hindered the growth of the organized religious body. He was enthusiastic in the belief that New-Church people would be quick to recognize the truth; and in company with some of them in 1889 the New-Churchman's Single Tax League was organized.

Quoting from the By-Laws of the League it was "An Association whose aim is to spread among receivers of the doctrines of the New Church a knowledge of the New Political Economy which advocates a single tax . . . To promote the study and practical application of the New Church and the New Economic System conjunctively To urge upon New-Church people the duty of working actively and practically toward the descent upon earth of the New Jerusalem." An advertisement in the *New-Church Messenger* brought such gratifying results that the League decided to publish a monthly paper devoted to its cause. Consequently *The New Earth* made its first appearance in November, 1889, with Mr. A. J. Auchterlonie as editor in chief and Mr. Filmer one of the associate editors. While the strongest appeal was to

New-Church people it was not long before many warm friends of other religious schools were attracted. The little paper became a medium for discussion among all those who believed that the solution of problems of political economy is to be found through application of religious principle. It continued to wield its influence until 1900 when Mr. Auchterlonie died. Mr. Filmer, however, never relinquished his interest in the work of spreading this truth as he saw it, but more and more he devoted his time to spreading these doctrines until it became the dominant occupation of his thought. His latter years were devoted exclusively to this service.

Deeply regretting the ritualistic tendency of the organized church and what he saw as a lack of interest in the practical application of this vital principle, brought down to workable form by Henry George, Mr. Filmer nevertheless remained a member of the Brooklyn Society of the New-Church. A man with great love for his fellow men, his most intimate friends were naturally among New-Church people and followers of Henry George. To know John ("Uncle John" to many of us) Filmer was to have had intellectual and spiritual comradeship with one of God's great souls. His mind was a light in dark places for us who are groping through this complex civilization to some guiding truth of life.

And it remained bright to the end of physical use. Almost the last act of his life was to tie up a manuscript of his recently finished work and address it to a friend. This is entitled: "The Three Relations in the Life of Man" with sub-titles: (1) "Man's Relation to Nature, Mother Earth." (2) "Man's Relation to his Fellow Man." (3) "Man's Relation to the Creator." Quoting from its pages: "These three relations in the life of man are of Divine Origin though they may appear as dead, they LIVE It is true that they may be buried under vast accumulations of human laws, ignorance and greed from which grave they MUST BE RESURRECTED and made THE SPIRITUAL FOUNDATION for the Holy City, New Jerusalem, which John saw descending from God out of Heaven TO THE EARTH." John Filmer believed the Lord had been teaching the gospel of Justice through many ages. His dominant aim was to serve this cause of Justice "that the earth should become the resting place of the City that lieth four-square, whose every dimension is equal." He carried his light faithfully and high, while his soul longed for the opening of willing eyes that they might see. His influence remains with those whose privilege it was to have contact with such a kind and loving personality; his work will bear fruit in season for it was service for mankind, and of such nothing is ever lost.

M. CEBELIA L'HOMMEDIEU

Industrial Economics

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HENRY GEORGE

[The following article, published in the Australian *Labor Daily* as a letter to the editor, has been slightly condensed.]

POLITICAL ECONOMY was at one time, and still is in most of our text-books, the driest, dullest, and most dismal of all the sciences. Yet it could be, and has been, made by far the most interesting of them all, for it deals with the things which interest us most—the production, distribution, and exchange of wealth, with wages, interest, and rent.

AN APPALLING PICTURE

What was known as Political Economy in the mid-Victorian era—and what it still is to a great extent—was a veritable Slough of Despond. It taught that wages were paid out of Capital, that the fund out of which wages were paid was consequently limited by the amount of capital existing at the time, and that the wage-earner had to depend for his living on the benevolence or philanthropy of the capitalist. According to it there was an iron law of wages—capital tending to increase in a less ratio than the number of workers—which must ever prevent the latter from obtaining more than a bare existence. It taught that population tended to increase faster than the means of subsistence, that war and pestilence were the means provided by a kindly Providence for keeping it within bounds, and that the poverty and misery of the masses were natural conditions and a part of the Divine scheme for which man was in no way to blame. It also taught that there was little, if any, difference between land and capital, that both were private property and could be held by the present owners or their descendants for ever and ever amen. This was the appalling picture painted by economists 50 years ago.

AN OUTSTANDING GENIUS

Suddenly there appeared a genius of outstanding merit, whose credentials came not from colleges or schools but from the spirit within, whose university was the world, who was successively sailor, miner, printer, editor, author and orator, who saw at a glance through the intricate maze of modern society, detected the fallacies underlying the economics of his day, and proclaimed a gospel which has Liberty for its watchword and the Emancipation of the Masses for its text. He died fighting in the streets of New York for the cause of humanity, but has already come to be recognized as the greatest man that America has produced, a social philosopher, according to Professor Dewey, ranking with Plato; and the keenest writer on economics, according to another professor, that the world has seen. Of all the books on Economics that have ever been issued from the press, his epoch-making one of "Progress and Poverty" is by far the most eloquent, the most

convincing and the most universally read. No name is held in greater reverence to-day than that of Henry George. Half a dozen Congresses have already been held in different parts of the world, attended by delegates from more than a score of different countries, to promulgate his views, and a seventh is to be held at Edinburgh during the present year.

THE NEW POLITICAL ECONOMY

Unaided by professors, and therefore unbiased by the schools, he examined the whole basis of the prevailing Political Economy for himself and "taught as one having authority and not as the Scribes." He tore the Economics of his day to shreds, and made Political Economy, what it certainly was not till he appeared, a science complete in itself and fraught with the greatest blessings to mankind. He showed that wages were not paid out of capital, but out of production; that employment was not limited by the purse of the capitalist but by access to land; that population did not tend to increase faster than the means of subsistence, but that there was abundance for all provided that land monopoly were abolished and natural resources made accessible to labor. He showed that the supposed iron law of wages was a myth, and that, under natural conditions, the whole of the product should go to labor, minus a return to capital in the shape of interest if capital were used. He proved that, under natural conditions, capital would not be the enemy of labor but its friend, since it is labor stored up for the purpose of assisting labor to produce more than it otherwise could, but that the real enemy of labor is land monopoly, which prevents labor from obtaining access to natural resources whence it could employ itself. Nor was this all. He further showed, what no economist before his day had realized—that wages, rent, and interest were interdependent; that whatever the product it had to be distributed between one or more of these three factors; if land were free and had no monetary value, as frequently occurs on the outskirts and in the "Never Never," the whole of the product would go to labor (save that which is confiscated in the form of taxation by the State); that, where land has a value and capital is not used, the product is distributed between the so-called land-owner and the worker (save for the portion already named); that where the three factors are concerned the product is distributed between the so-called land or mine owner as rent, the capitalist as interest, and the worker as wages. Therefore, if the worker gets less than his share of the product, it must be because either the land-owner or the capitalist, or both, get too much. In any case, whatever share the worker gets, a portion is deducted in the form of taxation by the State.

COMMUNAL AND SURFACE VALUES

There is only one scientific way to solve the problem caused by the small share which, under the present system, goes to the worker, and that is by preventing the so-called

land-owner or the capitalist, or both, from getting so much. Now, as the land belongs by right to the community as a whole, and not to the individual, the value attaching to it, which is directly caused solely by the presence and needs of the community, should go to the community and not to the individual. To achieve this end all that is necessary, as Henry George points out in his chapter on "How equal rights to the land may be asserted and secured," is "to appropriate rent (i.e., economic rent) by taxation, and to abolish all taxation save that upon land values." As all land value belongs by right to the community, its appropriation by the State on behalf of the community would not be a tax in the true sense of the word, however much it might appear to be so. There is no blame attaching to the so-called land-owners for confiscating the economic rent. Whatever blame there is attaches to the people for allowing them to do so. Once this value is appropriated on behalf of the community, or commenced to be appropriated, for it can only be done gradually, there will be no need to bother about the surplus value, that bugbear of Karl Marx, which is supposed to be squeezed by the capitalist out of labor. The central feature of the new Political Economy is not surplus value but communal value, which, having been created by the community, should be appropriated on behalf of the community to meet the expenses incurred by the community. When this is done every one will be placed on an equal footing in regard to the land, access to it and to all natural resources will be easier and easier as the appropriation is increased, the avenues of employment will be enlarged, and the ability of the workers not only to produce what they consume but to consume what they produce will correspondingly increase. This is the science of the New Political Economy as taught by Henry George. It means the dawn of a new and brighter era for the workers all over the world, and it only waits their intelligent study and active co-operation to be carried into effect. To do so would mean a revolution, but a revolution by peaceable means, and without the shedding of a single drop of blood.

PERCY R. MEGGY.

"And idleness enforced saw idle land,
Leagues of unpeopled soil, the common earth,
Wall'd round with paper against God and man."

—JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL

—Let Freedom ring! But not too loud or long—
Or some injunction judge will stop her song!

—The man who makes two blades of grass appear
Will pay more taxes than he paid last year.

—All men want freedom. How few understand
Freedom can never be without free land.

Land Owning—Its Use and Abuse: An Enquiry

Preliminary to the discussion of the existing system of land tenure and its consequences, let us consider the opinions of some eminent authorities.:

SIR WILLIAM BLACKSTONE: "Accurately and strictly speaking, there is no foundation in Nature or natural law why a set of words on parchment should convey the dominion of land.

Allodial (absolute) property no subject in England now has; it being a received and now undeniable principle in law that all lands in England are holden mediately or immediately of the King."

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE COLERIDGE: "These (our Land Laws) might be for the general advantage, and if they could be shown to be so, by all means they should be maintained; but if not, does any man with what he is pleased to call his mind deny that a state of law under which such mischief could exist, under which the country itself would exist, not for its people, but for a mere handful of them, ought to be instantly and absolutely set aside."

SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK, ON "ENGLISH LAND LAWS": "It is commonly supposed that land belongs to its owner in the same sense as money or a watch. This is not the theory of English Law since the Norman Conquest, nor has it been so in its full significance at any time.

No absolute ownership of land is recognized by our law books, except in the Crown. All lands are supposed to be held immediately or mediately of the Crown, though no rent or services may be payable and no grant from the Crown on record."

WILLIAMS (REAL PROPERTY): "The first thing the student has to do, is to get rid of the idea of absolute ownership (of land). Such an idea is quite unknown to the English law. No man is in law the absolute owner of land.

All owners are merely tenants in the eye of the law."

MR. JUSTICE LONGFIELD: "Property in land differs in its origin from property in any commodity produced by human labor; the product of labor naturally belongs to the laborer who produced it, but the same argument does not apply to land, which is not produced by labor, but is the gift of the Creator of the world to mankind. Every argument used to give an ethical foundation for the exclusive right of property in land has a latent fallacy."

PROF. W. A. HUNTER, M.A., LL.B.: "The English landlord system, so far from having any moral basis, is founded upon a supercilious contempt of the only moral principle that can afford any justification for private property in land."

PROF. ZACIAIRE (the eminent German Jurist): "All the sufferings against which civilized nations have to struggle may be referred to the exclusive right of property in the soil as their source."

PROF. ALFRED MARSHALL (Principles of Economics): "All writers on economics are compelled to make a distinction between land and other things."

CARDINAL MANNING: "The Land Question means: hunger, thirst, nakedness, notice to quit, labor spent in vain, the toil of years seized upon, the breaking up of homes, the misery, sickness, deaths of parents, children, wives, the despair and wildness which spring up in the hearts of the poor when legal force, like a sharp harrow, goes over the most sensitive and vital right of mankind. All this is contained in the 'Land Question.'"

ALFRED RUSSELL WALLACE: "We permit absolute possession of the soil of our country with no legal rights of existence on the soil to the vast majority who do not possess it. A great land-owner may legally convert his whole property into a forest or hunting ground, and expel every human being who has hitherto lived upon it.

In a thickly populated country like England, where almost every acre has its owner and occupier, this is a power of legally destroying

his fellow creatures; and that such a power should exist and be exercised by individuals, in however small the degree, indicates that, as regards true social science, we are still in a state of barbarism."

HENRY GEORGE: "If one man can command the land upon which others must labor, he can appropriate the produce of their labor as the price of his permission to labor. The fundamental law of Nature that her enjoyment by man shall be consequent upon his exertions is thus violated. The one receives without producing, the others produce without receiving. The one is unjustly enriched; the others are robbed.

That people can be enslaved just as effectually by making property of their lands as by making property of their bodies is a truth that conquerors in all ages have recognized, and that, as society developed, the strong and unscrupulous who desired to live off the labors of others, have been prompt to see."

WILLIAM SAUNDERS: "Every month landlords kill more children than Herod destroyed in his lifetime; and yet 'they are all honorable men.' But this circumstance does not lessen the fearful consequences of the system of which they are the agents."

JOHN STUART MILL: "No man made the land; it is the original inheritance of the whole species. The land of every country belongs to the people of that country."

GLADSTONE: "I fully admit this: that if the time came when the British Nation found that the land should be naturalized, and it would be wise to do it, they have a perfect right to do it."

CARLYLE: "The notion of selling for certain bits of metal—the land of the World Creator, is a ridiculous impossibility.

The widow is gathering nettles for her children's dinner. A perfumed Seigneur, delicately lounging in the *Oeil de Boeuf*, hath an alchemy whereby he will extract the third nettle and call it 'rent.'

Properly speaking, the land belongs to these two: to the Almighty God, and to all His children of men that have ever worked well on it. No generation of men can or could, with never such solemnity and effort, sell land on any other principle. It is not the property of any one generation, we say, but that of all the generations that have worked on it, and of all the future ones that shall work on it."

JOHN RUSKIN: "Bodies of men, land, water, and air, are the principal of those things which are not, and which it is criminal to consider, as personal or exchangeable property."

The opinions here cited being true, it is clear that Land Monopoly is, and always has been, one of the main causes of the world's economic distress.

The minds of men today have solved great problems of every description; and yet, one of the greatest problems of them all, the most vital to human welfare, remains: the Land Question is still the "riddle of the Ages."

Despite the clear indictments by the great thinkers and writers of all ages, from Moses to Christ and down to the times we now live in, there still exists in full force, *private ownership of land*.

The minds of all men today are concentrated upon solving the problem of Peace and War. Nations are endeavoring to find a solution of that great curse that has for centuries destroyed them by periodically recurring wars.

War palpably disrupts each nation resorting to it and visibly occasions its destruction. Land Monopoly works more insidiously than War; few see and realize its evils. For centuries, freedom was non-existent. Men thought it could never be achieved. And yet body-slavery, except in certain benighted countries, has been abolished.

But another form of slavery—economic—has taken the place of body-slavery. Some ingenious men have

learned that their fellow men may be enslaved through private ownership of land, which belongs to the whole people. Land should never have been deeded away through the subtle schemes and plots of private land monopolists.

And yet, the war menace is being removed, though ever so slowly. It is passing. In time, it will disappear from among mankind.

After the War Evil has been conquered, the evils and injustices of private ownership of land must also be abolished. Today, men know many things which a few years back were profound mysteries—the X-Ray, Radio, Human Flight, the hitherto unknown Poles, are giving up their secrets; medical and physical science are achieving wonders. Despite the advances in science, our economic and political progress is at a standstill. Only a few daring minds, gifted with prescience, such as men like the late Henry George, and his precursors, have tackled this Land Problem.

Why is the great Land Question still an international World Problem? Why does war still exist? Why has Christ been mocked and denied? Human selfishness, the lust for Greed and Power, are the retarding forces blocking the way to progress and human freedom in these our times, as of old.

The great truths preached by the prophets throughout the ages are none the less true today even though human selfishness forbids them to be recognized. Greed for power is operating against human welfare. It says to Progress, "Thou shalt not pass." The Economic Verdun is unconquered.

The great authorities quoted at the beginning of this enquiry amply prove that the private ownership of land is wrong and against human welfare, just as it is wrong in these days to own the body of a human being and keep him as a slave. To monopolize the land on which men must live is but another form of monopolizing the air they must breathe. If our modern engineering wizards could erect enormous suction pumps and draw into them the air men must breathe, these engineering geniuses could command the lives of men. In order to breathe, we would all have to pay tribute to the suction crowd of air monopolists.

Land, the earth we live on, is the free gift of the Creator to men living in and on the world today. Yet all lands in all cities throughout the world today are privately owned. Land monopolists, not satisfied with ownership of all city lands, have extended their monopoly to all prairie and farm lands, all mines, all forests, even our inland rivers and waterways are privately monopolized and exploited. Our Falls and Sinclairs have become multi-millionaires through dishonestly misappropriating to their private use Public Property in Land. Our formerly vast Public Domain has been meanly stolen. The public has been betrayed and robbed, and is being daily so robbed and betrayed.

Land in our cities receives its great value because people must dwell in our cities to make their living. All who live in cities increase by their mere presence the value of the lands they dwell on. They make lands valuable and create what are technically called by economists "land values." Presence of population alone makes land "location valuable." Broadway at the corner of Wall Street has immense value because millions of people must work there daily and this special plot is very desirable for business purposes. A corner lot far removed from population would command no rent, exact no tribute, possess no "land value."

Far out in the country, far enough out to be only farm land, far from railroads, community centres, from population, no land values or site values exist. These values begin to arise solely through population. Farm lands are nothing but farm lands until population comes to turn farms into building lots by the presence of population.

If population creates the great land value in New York City, is there any reason why the great population of New York City should longer disinherit themselves and leave these great land values in the hands of private monopolists? The ancestors of these present-day monopolists happened to buy these lands for a few trinkets from Indians who neglected to work the lands even for their own crop-raising purposes. Is there any reason why a handful of ignorant savages with no lawful title should barter for a handful of beads a heritage which today brings into private hands—the heirs of this shameful trafficking—millions of dollars' worth of land value, rightly belonging to the population whose presence in New York City actually created those values? Why should this value go to the heirs of those who befooled the Indians with trinkets and indifferent rum?

It is clear that the presence of population has created and is creating these values in the lands they work on and they are really entitled to the revenues coming from the values they thus create.

In order to transfer these enormous sums of money from the private pockets into which they now unrightly go, into the pockets of the rightful owners—the creators of the land values—it is only necessary to tax these lands for the public benefit; taxing these lands in accordance with their location. The corner at Broadway and Wall Street would of course pay into the public treasury many times more than would be paid by some obscure plot in the Bronx. No titles need be disturbed to carry out this plan, the taxing authorities simply requiring that the public revenue should be paid to the public who owns that revenue. Private ownership has for centuries in the past already been many times over compensated by having possessed these lands all these years. The public is not asking for an accounting and restoration—an accounting of stewardship—which they might well do.

No present titles need be disturbed. It would only be necessary to tax the present bare site value of all lands, but not any of the improvements; simply taking for the public use the site value, as if no building were on the location. If all city lands were taxed thus, immense burdens would be lifted from the shoulders of the people, now groaning under economic pressure exerted by the owners of site, or land, values.

The removing of these great burdens from builders would be an immense boon to the building trade. It would do away overnight almost with the present unemployment in the building and allied trades.

RECAPITULATION

1. Unemployment is today one of the greatest of our world-problems: Unskilled as well as skilled labor would be emancipated by restoring to the people the lands of which they have been deprived.

If building lands, now held out of use, by private monopoly, are taxed so heavily that they would have to be put to productive use, the demand for cheap housing would be met, and the private and age-long monopoly of a great public source of revenue would be destroyed.

2. The present housing problem is intensified by land speculation. All lands at present held out of the market for purely speculative purposes should be forced upon the market by an adequate land tax. Opening these lands will enable builders to purchase lands and improve them. Overcrowding in our great cities would thus be done away with.

3. Land being made accessible to all, there would be no necessity for skilled workers to seek a living in other countries or districts far from their homes. Work would be provided for all willing and able to employ themselves.

4. In agricultural districts, whence laborers are being driven by necessity into already crowded cities, small holdings can be re-established by removing all taxes on improvements and buildings on purely farm or agricultural lands. Improvements on purely farm lands can be made without fear of taxation on such improvements. Farm land would not be taxed for its location value until it grew into city land by the coming of population. All purely farm land would be cheap and remain untaxed unless and until its value is enhanced by population; until it possessed municipal, or community, value.

5. By properly taxing all lands throughout the country, including coal, oil, and mineral deposits, it would be impossible for private owners of such lands to hold them against the public weal as is customary today. The public would thus receive the revenue—value now going into private possession. These lands belong to the public whose necessities create their value, and the public should be given whatever revenues they bring in. This could readily be achieved, without disturbing a single title, by proper and adequate taxation, placed on the value of such land, this value enhancing with the years and the increase of population.

Does anyone "with what he is pleased to call his mind" deny that public need, not private greed, creates these values? Public necessity demands the conservation of our forests, oil lands, coal deposits, mineral deposits, and it is the presence of population in our great cities that makes these natural resources necessary. Eliminate the demands of the great cities like Pittsburgh for coal and iron, to supply the great needs of our transportation facilities—again a public need—and industry would become non-existent. Public needs and demands create the value of our mines, oil wells, forests, and without this public demand there would be no necessity for such products. Our huge populations create these values, and the fact of a few miles of railroad transportation, or pipe lines, does not bar the public from their natural right to the use of these gifts of nature, belonging originally to the public lands, but filched by corrupt officialdom (not so "dumb" as to their own private interests). The chicanery and rascality of some men have deprived the public of their heritage in these lands. As population in our great cities and throughout the country creates these values, as they are really part of the Public Domain which should never have been alienated, it follows that these valuable lands (made valuable by population needs for the running of industry) should be taxed back into the public till, from which they have been meanly filched.

6. Proper adjustment of the land question would bring employee and employer into the position of "equal partners" and there would be unanimity of purpose in increasing and enhancing improvements; these improvements being free from taxation as improvements. These would be no taxes of any kind, except on the value of the bare land as occupying a special value owing to its advantageous location.

Under such conditions wages would advance to their true earning capacity. No man would work for inadequate wages if he could make more money employing himself. Such adjustment would do away with "industrial sweating," or the exploitation of one class of the population by the other, more advantageously located.

7. Great city lands, now possessed by private monopolists, should be taxed into community ownership. All land rents or site rents—due to location advantage—belong to the community of each city which has created these great site-values. The public revenue from all these site-values would be more than ample to meet municipal needs, and indeed create funds to be set aside for great public improvements.

8. Taxing the values of all lands possessing site or location value to the full extent of such community value would raise a fund large enough to do away with all other forms of taxation. Income taxes would be abolished; also excise and customs duties. There would be created each year an enormous surplus to be used for the public benefit.

9. No improvements would be penalized, as at present; factories, workshops, and all methods of production would be freed from present burdens; there would be no taxes on machinery or buildings, however costly or splendid they might be.

10. Persons possessing buildings and household property would be relieved of all forms of taxation except on their bare lands provided they possessed community value and could devote their revenues to improving their buildings without being taxed for any improvements.

11. No women or children would be compelled to work, as today, for the reason that all industrious men could easily support their families.

12. The public would not be asked to support charity societies, "Salvation" or otherwise, for the reason that the "soup kitchen" would not exist. Ample funds would be created to provide the aged and infirm with every comfort without requiring of them (in return for mere subsistence) degrading or penal work.

W. B. NORTHROP.

Death of W. B. Northrop

OUR old friend William B. Northrop, author of the foregoing article, which he designed to have printed in pamphlet form after its appearance in *LAND AND FREEDOM*, called at this office May 7th and showed us the manuscript. He said it was not in good shape for the printer and then carried it to a stenographer in an adjoining office to be typewritten. On Wednesday he came again and left the article newly typewritten in the shape in which it now appears. He left the office to dine with a friend, Henry W. Haviland, at 99 Water Street, and a few hours later was dead.

It is surprising that Mr. Northrop was so little known among Single Taxers, for he had written much for the cause. He was an active newspaper man after graduating from Georgetown University. He was born in San Francisco. He was connected with the *New York World*, the *New York Globe* and other newspapers. He went to London and there gathered material which Lloyd George used in his Budget fight against the House of Lords. The fact that Mr. Northrop was a Single Taxer gave him an eager zest in the collection of this material, which when presented to the House of Commons received world-wide attention.

When the public became interested in the speeches and letters of the late Mayor Gaynor, Mr. Northrop induced the Mayor to permit him to publish in book form selections from his most characteristic utterances, and at the request of the Mayor Mr. Northrop wrote the introduction to this publication. In addition to this work Mr. Northrop was the author of "Wealth and Want" and "With Pen and Camera," the former being a study of London poverty, and the latter an account of Mr. Northrop's trip around the world. During the War he was a member of the

Intelligence Bureau and special agent of the Arson Bureau of the National Board of Fire Underwriters.

Single Taxers and the world generally know far too little of the devoted and intelligent work of W. B. Northrop for the regeneration of the social order. While comparatively a young man Mr. Northrop had been engaged in world-wide endeavors to bring about a condition where want and misery would be banished from the earth. Of a serious and earnest nature, he possessed nevertheless a rich vein of humor which made his conversation a welcome diversion, while at the same time it no doubt helped him to keep sane and sweet in facing the appalling misery and suffering he sought to cure. A delightful camaraderie, an unusually keen intellect, a gentle, lovable personality—these and more were the attributes of our friend so suddenly called away. Mr. Northrop was one of the closest friends of Dick George, with whom he had so much in common. One of the finest things ever done by Dick as a sculptor is the bust of W. B. Northrop now in the possession of Mrs. Northrop.

Funeral services for Mr. Northrop were conducted at the funeral parlors at Atlantic Avenue, Brooklyn, on May 11th, by Rev. Carl Podin, and Mr. Haviland, his lifelong friend, delivered a eulogy and recited "Crossing the Bar." A large delegation from the New York Fire Department and Board of Fire Underwriters were present and there was a profusion of flowers. The services were attended by his 86-year-old mother, his widow, two sons and a daughter; Joseph H. Fink, who knew him well, and a large number of personal friends. The remains were cremated.

A Unique Advertisement

THE enclosed advertisement appears in the Dallas *Morning News* from W. S. Chambero, real estate dealer of that city. L. V. LaTaste, of Dallas, calls it "the only honest land broker advertisement I have ever seen."

"The great bull market in stocks has stopped—perhaps for some time. It is now appropriate to switch your profits, if you have any, from Wall Street to "Main Street"—into the "bull market" for "unearned increment."

In a growing city like Dallas carefully chosen parcels of real estate will bring profits in increasing land values resulting from the growth of the community."

From the President of Hunter College

"OUR present civilization is disposed to overemphasize the material aspects of progress," Dr. Kieran declared. "In fact, it goes even further. It assumes that material expansion is progress. Misled by popular opinion, education may easily subscribe to this error."

Henry George and Modern Philosophic Thought

ADDRESS OF PROF. GEORGE GEIGER

[Professor George Geiger, son of our Oscar Geiger, is head of the Department of Philosophy in the Bradley Technological Institute, Peoria, Ill. The following address by the distinguished young educator was delivered before the Chicago Single Tax Club at a well-attended meeting, and will interest our readers as coming from a young man who is destined to be heard from in the years to come.]

MR. TOASTMASTER and fellow-followers of Henry George, I am glad to be with you tonight and I assure you that I fully appreciate the honor you confer upon me in making me your guest of the evening.

I'm not quite sure whether I should bring you greetings from Peoria or from New York City. From my brief visits to Chicago, I am under the impression that both of these places, if not unpopular, are at least somewhat non-grata in your town; one, I suppose, because it might remind you of the type of small, mid-western village from which Chicago has been graduated—at least in size—and the other because it is more successful in keeping its crime waves out of the news columns. But I think that, as far as our movement is concerned, I'll cast my allegiance out here (no, not in the west; I used to think that this was the west, but I have had it recently impressed upon me that it is not); anyway, I believe that out here—in the north central regions—there is still hope for you, while I'm afraid that we in the east are beyond redemption.

I don't want to appear, however, to be over-emphasizing any note of discouragement. On the contrary, there is much justification for encouragement. That is a good old bromide and one that I've heard at every Single Tax dinner, but I should like to attempt in a small measure to justify that statement, not by an reference to the actual progress of our work throughout the world—you have read and heard enough of that—but merely by a reference to a very significant pronouncement on the part of a scholar who is undoubtedly America's and perhaps the world's foremost thinker and philosopher, a man whose name is indeed one to conjure with. I refer, of course, to Professor John Dewey. I am quite certain that all of you have read his preface of appreciation to Prof. Brown's abridgement of "Progress and Poverty," and I believe also that you have heard that he has permitted his name to appear as a member of the advisory committee of the Henry George Foundation.

I am not going to attempt to estimate the impetus that the name of Professor Dewey will give to our movement in academic circles where up to now Henry George has been so inexcusably disregarded, but his influence is sure to be a very significant one. However, I realize that the reputation the academic world has acquired regarding its lack of permeability to ideas originating outside of its own

dominions, may too well be substantiated. But the academic world must and will be affected by Professor Dewey's words and "Progress and Poverty" will be discussed in places where now it is not even a name.

So this evening I should like very briefly to emphasize what I think are the reasons for and the significance of Professor Dewey's interest in the work of Henry George. Note, I do not say the reasons why he (using the words in quotation marks) is a Single Taxer. To tell the truth, despite the fact that I have the great privilege of working under Professor Dewey—in fact, of writing my doctor's dissertation on the "philosophy of Henry George" under his direction—I can't see fit to label him a Single Taxer or anything else, for that matter, except a great liberal and a great progressive. You know, there are Single Taxers and Single Taxers. There are those—and it is well that there is a great number of them—who hold that the proposals of Henry George alone are sufficient to introduce a new order of society in which the golden age will be realized. There are those—and I suppose my father is an example—who are even more than utopians, actually fanatics, "the dervish howling in the wilderness," as I believe my father has been characterized. Then there are those who are attracted by the ideals, the vision, the philosophy of Henry George, but who do not pay very much attention to his specific proposals. And there are those who are interested in the single tax merely because they find in it a scientific and efficient scheme of taxation, who regard it as nothing more than a fiscal, administrative change in government finance. And, of course, there are still other approaches to Henry George. So even if I did feel that I could designate Professor Dewey as a "Single Taxer," I would not know in which category to place him. I hardly think that he believes the Single Tax to be a panacea for all our mortal ills, and I am quite as certain that he is more than the mere "tax reformer." But putting aside this matter of attempting to label or pigeon-hole a thinker such as John Dewey, I should like, as I said, to mention just a few of the factors that make it possible for the economics of Henry George to be correlated with a philosophy such as pragmatism—that typical American school of thought which Prof. Dewey has been so largely instrumental in developing.

I don't of course, intend to bore you with any technical discussion of philosophy, but I do believe that it is important to understand some of the specific implications that may be considered significant in linking the work of Henry George with that of pragmatism. First of all, while it is the height of injustice to attempt to give any brief and superficial definition of a movement such as pragmatism, let me say that the pragmatic approach to philosophy—and by philosophy I mean whatever is called up in your mind by the name—is one which is attempting to remove philosophy from its other-wordly, sacrosanct, metaphysical position that it has held all through the history of intellectual enterprise, and to place it where it will be as

helpful in solving the real problems of mankind as are the sciences. Philosophy has always concerned itself with questions of ultimate reality and ultimate truth, with problems of the validity of knowledge and thought as abstract categories, with attempts to deal with the metaphysical relations between man and the universe. In fact, philosophy has meant nothing more—or nothing less—than the elaborate and technical discussion of such problems, and when I suggested that by philosophy I mean whatever is called up in your mind by the word, I am quite sure that some such conception was the one that came before you.

Now, stating that pragmatism is endeavoring to change that traditional emphasis is not to be interpreted by any means as an attempt to cast any aspersions upon such typically, or rather traditionally philosophic enterprises; that certainly would evince a small and unappreciative grasp of the history of human thought. But pragmatists, by their attack upon traditional philosophy mean that human speculation, if it is to be significant and operative and something more than academic and scholastic logic-chopping, must concern itself with the problems of the here and now. Perhaps the entire absorption of philosophy into metaphysics and epistemology was quite appropriate for days in which theology and a mythological psychology were all-important, but men now are concerned with other problems, with problems of social adjustment, of political change, of economic balance, and philosophy, if it is to be at all instrumental, must directly attack such problems, ally itself to the sciences directly and experimentally, and turn its back upon the fascinating yet largely fruitless discussions that for so long have constituted the whole realm of philosophy. Pragmatism is asking philosophy to come down from its ivory tower, is asking that the philosopher come out of his closet and his arm-chair. For many, such a demand means the very annihilation of philosophy, but such a charge has terrors only for those who hold that philosophy must always be defined in medieval terms.

To phrase this general thought in another way, pragmatism holds that philosophy is in error not in its solutions of problems, but in the problems themselves. In the words of Professor Dewey, the pragmatic effort "may be looked upon as an attempt to forward the emancipation of philosophy from too intimate and exclusive attachment to traditional problems. It is not in intent a criticism of various solutions that have been offered, but raises a question as to the genuineness, under the present conditions of science and social life, of the problems." Philosophy has clung to old problems, to artificial problems, and new issues have been disregarded. Philosophy has not sufficiently concerned itself with contemporary difficulties, and, (for pragmatism,) that is the reason why philosophy has achieved the reputation for being old and artificial itself, a reputation that makes it something impractical, abstract, a trifle doddering and senile. "Unless

professional philosophy," Professor Dewey warns, "can mobilize itself sufficiently to assist in the clarification and redirection of men's thoughts, it is likely to get more and more side-tracked from the main currents of contemporary life."

I do not like to use the usual phrases in describing this phase of pragmatism, those which state that pragmatism is philosophy made practical, that pragmatism judges a philosophic conception by the measure in which it works—I say I don't like to use such descriptions because if not understood in their proper setting, they may give a very banal and plumber-like connotation to what is really a profound philosophical contribution. If, however, we interpret the words "practical" and "workable" as meaning the necessity of making philosophy and reason and intelligence efficient instruments in achieving some worthwhile end, then the words really serve their purpose.

But after this—perhaps too long—excursion into the general significance or approach of pragmatism, let us see more specifically what relation this has to Henry George. I believe that you do see now what sort of a relation it must be. One, if not the greatest, of problems that contemporary society has to face is that of the economic maladjustment that is so obviously a part of our present social order. We do have progress and poverty, wealth and want, misery, vice, crime, and all the pathological symptoms of a diseased structure. Here is a problem that cannot be put aside, that refuses to allow itself to be ignored, and yet philosophy has ignored it. It is one of those problems, those contemporary difficulties, that pragmatism insists must be recognized by philosophy, if philosophy is to have any real significance.

Of course, if we translate the problem of social and economic maladjustment into the terms of a more abstract vocabulary, and call it the problem of evil, then certainly philosophy, under its great divisions of moral and ethical theory, has concerned itself with such a problem. But how? Chiefly by attempting to explain away—often even to justify—evil by calling it some form of good in disguise, by making it merely the shadows in a great cosmic landscape, the discords which contribute to the grand and eternal harmony of things. That's no way to solve a problem of evil, no way to attack such a direct, work-a-day, practical—if you will—problem of the poverty, crime, vice, disease, which make up what we mean by evil.

Philosophy traditionally had discussed evil but has not attempted to do anything about it; now, however, to quote Professor Dewey, "the problem of evil ceases to be a theological and metaphysical one, and is perceived to be the practical problem of reducing, alleviating, as far as may be removing, the evils of life. Philosophy is no longer under obligation to find ingenious methods for proving that evils are only apparent, not real, or to elaborate schemes for explaining them away, or, worse yet, for justifying them. It assumes another obligation:—That of contributing in

however humble a way to methods that will assist us in discovering the causes of humanity's ills." And again: "Morally, men are now concerned with the amelioration of the conditions of the common lot in this world."

That word "morally" in the last quotation more directly introduces the thought that I am trying to emphasize. I realize that if technical, professional philosophy is to concern itself with our present diseased social and economic structure, the problem must be phrased not in social or economic terms, but in moral ones. But right here is a major difficulty. Philosophy has traditionally kept the realms of morals, or ethics, and of economics separate, in air-tight compartments, carefully insulated—(to change the metaphor)—one from the other. A dualism has been set up, and the moral order has been not only divorced from the problems of economics—that is the problems involved in man's efforts to satisfy his material wants, to make a "living"—it has been made superior to such lower affairs, and has often been given authority over what was regarded as a cruder and less abstract realm. Moral ends have been exalted, and the means to those ends have been neglected. The noble concepts of Right and Duty, of Virtue and the Good, have been raised by moral philosophy as the ideals and goals of life, and little attention has been paid to the methods of reaching those ends. There has been a dialectical separation of "higher," as applied to moral matters, and "lower" as applied to economic, or, if you prefer, practical affairs. It has not been recognized that before men can live well or nobly, they must just live, and that before ideals can be realized there are wants that must be satisfied.

If there is one thing that pragmatism, and particularly Professor Dewey in his ethical works, has attacked, it is just this conception of a divorce between moral ends and the means—chiefly economic—to those ends. Morality, social morality that is, the desire for a society that will realize some of the ideals and aspirations of men, can function only if it is to be related to something fundamental and tangible. There is nothing more fundamental to the life of man than the earth itself, nothing more tangible than the fact that all of mankind's needs come from land. Henry George has disclosed the means whereby mankind can come into possession of the land and distribute equitably the products of the earth. It is for philosophy now to show that moral considerations are dependent on fundamental economic adjustments.

It was George's really great fusion of economics and morals that, I believe, has attracted the attention of a pragmatist such as Professor Dewey. Here in "Progress and Poverty" was a scathing, passionate indictment of our existing social structure, and a vision of a new order of things in which man's ethical ideals might be realized, but it was not merely an indictment and a vision and a hope. There have been visions ever since the days of the prophets. Here in "Progress and Poverty" was a pene-

trating and profound realization of an economic maladjustment, a maladjustment that was crushing out the very life of society, but this was more than an economic treatise. There have been many of them. The two were joined in Henry George; the criticism of society and the hope for a higher social order were not merely pious protestations—they were directly linked to something that pointed to the cause of the diseased conditions and showed the way to change them.

The necessity for the joining of economic means to moral ends may seem quite obvious, but I can assure you that the separation of the two has been a characteristic philosophic tradition; and therefore George's synthesis must have its appeal to those who realize the fundamental weakness and contradiction in such a separation. George's ultimate interests and ideals were dominantly ethical; his immediate concerns were economic—but between "ultimate" and "immediate" there was no chasm. He realized implicitly, if not explicitly,—(for by no stretch of the imagination can George be termed a pragmatist—his philosophic background and, more particularly his personal approach to matters of religion and philosophy were entirely alien to much of later pragmatic thought)—that ends removed from means were "meaningless"; they were something set out in a great and aloof void and carefully protected from contact and corruption. Also that means removed from ends were inadequate, inoperative, undirected. I need not here work out in detail the direct correlation between our present social conditions and our system of property in land; that would be gratuitous in a gathering of Single Taxers. And besides, I have no intention of talking single tax economics this evening—there are too many authorities present.

I wish merely to suggest this evening that this one element in Henry George's thought, the fusion of ends and means, of morals and economics, an element which may not appear to Single Taxers to be the most important in the work of George, has, I feel, the most fundamental and ideational appeal for a movement such as pragmatism. These sentences from Professor Dewey's preface to the "Significant Paragraphs from 'Progress and Poverty'" will perhaps illustrate what I have been trying to emphasize here: "I do not say these things in order to vaunt his (George's) place as a thinker in contrast with the merits of his proposals for a change in methods of distributing the burdens of taxation. To my mind the two things go together. His clear intellectual insight into social conditions, his passionate feeling for the remediable ills from which humanity suffers, find their logical conclusion in his plan for liberating labor and capital from the shackles which now bind them. . . . There have been economists of great repute who in their pretension to be scientific have ignored the most significant elements in human nature. There have been others who were emotionally stirred by social ills and who proposed glowing schemes

of betterment, but who passed lightly over facts. It is the thorough fusion of insight into actual facts and forces, with recognition of their bearing upon what makes human life worth living, that constitutes Henry George one of the world's great social philosophers."

Lecture Itinerary of Charles LeBaron Goeller

DURING April Chas. LeBaron Goeller lectured on Henry George and Progress and Poverty at a number of colleges in New York. He spoke before two classes at Hartwick Seminary, and on a return engagement at the chapel hour to the entire body of students and faculty. Union College and Rensselaer Polytechnic, and Skidmore College, were other institutions where lectures were given before economic classes.

In May Mr. Goeller made a trip through the New England states, speaking first at the International Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass., going from there to the Massachusetts Agricultural College, near Amherst. From there he went to Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., and then to Brown University, where two lectures were given. The next week's lectures were given at Colby College, and Bates College, in Maine, and before the Kiwanis Club of Waterville. The trip concluded with a visit to Northfield College and a lecture before 300 students in the chapel; followed by a question-and-answer session with two classes in sociology.

These lectures by Mr. Goeller are being conducted under the auspices of a committee formed for this purpose, (Messrs. J. D. Miller, A. C. Pleydell and Miss Charlotte Schetter) and will be continued. While the main object is to secure engagements before college classes, Mr. Goeller will address other gatherings while on his trips, which will be mostly within a radius of 500 miles from New York. Correspondence should be addressed directly to Chas. LeBaron Goeller, Union, N. Y.

There have been many press notices of Mr. Goeller's lectures. The Oneonta (N. Y.) *Daily Star* said: "It is Mr. Goeller's belief that the Creator has created an abundance for all men, that poverty and slum-life are man-made, and that as soon as men make their laws in the pattern of God's laws, lack and suffering and their attendant evils will disappear from the earth."

The Waterville, (Me.) *Morning Sentinel* said: "He treated the question in the light of science and by means of charts and pictures illustrated his address, showing how the method of taxation he advocates would do away with much of the poverty of the world and make for better living conditions."

The *News-Dispatch*, of Endicott, N. Y., commenting on Mr. Goeller's return from his lecture tour to his home town says:

He reports being received with the utmost courtesy wherever he went. The noted college professors, authorities in political economy and civil government, and their classes, among them students sure to be great public leaders and thinkers in the coming years, if not already so, showed deep interest in the discussions, and Mr. Goeller was kept busy answering questions and inquiries as to the underlying principles of Single Tax, and sometimes the ensuing conference between lecturer and teacher would last an hour or longer. Mr. Goeller is enthusiastic at the fine reception accorded him and feels the territory visited will prove fruitful of results.

Farewell Dinner to Prof. F. W. Roman

A MEETING of Single Taxers took place at the National Vaudeville Club on April 30th. The occasion was a farewell dinner called by the Manhattan Single Tax Club for Prof. F. W. Roman, on his departure for Europe. Otto Dorn presided and Prof. Roman was the only speaker.

Prof. Roman explained that one of the objects of his visit to Europe was to obtain further facts for the revision of his work on education in Europe. He wanted to visit Ireland, to observe what progress had been made and whether any economic benefits had followed on the acquirement of political freedom. He was anxious to ascertain the workings of the dole in Great Britain, and to what extent the facts bear out the statement that the great estates are being broken up.

Prof. Roman said that if he accepted the Marxian doctrine that we are all creatures of environment he would not believe that it was possible for men to form their own ideals independent of their environment.

He compared the decrease in numbers of those who own land in this country with the increase in the number of landowners in Denmark, and he wanted to ascertain the reason. He wanted to find out the growth of the cooperative movement in Denmark, and what relation that movement had to the increase of landholding. He would ascertain the facts regarding economic conditions and what changes had been made in the tariff.

He told interestingly of his forum work in California, of his battles with the American Federation of Labor, which had brought against him accusations that he was unpatriotic, that he was a representative of Sovietism, and that he was a communist. Of course, said Prof. Roman, they knew I was not a communist. What is the explanation of these attacks? Because the leaders of the Federation know that once the question of exploitation and speculation of various kinds is brought squarely up before the people something must be done about it. And they are not prepared to meet the questions that must then be answered. They have no solution, and somebody or something must be made the "goat" to ward off the approaching problems and the inevitable discussions that must follow. Hence the attacks upon those who

start out to teach. But despite these crazy charges the cause of adult education is here and here to stay.

Prof. Roman stated that he now had nine forums and was addressing three thousand men and women each week. These people come week after week. He had sold over 1500 copies of "Progress and Poverty." He had devoted one series of evenings to Dove and had sold many copies of the Theory of Human Progression. Meetings had also been given over to the discussion of the farm problem.

The speaker thought the Forum idea practical anywhere in the United States, was confident that it would grow and extend to other states, and closed with an expression of hope for democracy to which he hoped that the Forum movement would contribute.

At the conclusion of his very interesting address Dr. Roman answered questions. The meeting broke up about eleven o'clock and nearly all remained to felicitate the speaker and to wish him all success on his mission abroad.

Among the diners were Charles O'Connor Hennessy, Mrs. Hennessy, Mrs. Anna George deMille, Edward Polak, A. C. Pleydell, Josiah Dudley, Harold Benedict, Walter Fairchild, Charles T. Root, Miss Antoinette Kaufmann, Mr. and Mrs. P. H. Cornick, Dr. Marion Miller, Mr. and Mrs. James R. Brown and others.

After A Half Century

[The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation publishes the Fiftieth Anniversary Edition of Progress and Poverty.]

IN recognition of the fact that it is just fifty years since the appearance of the first edition of "Progress and Poverty," the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation has just produced from new plates a handsome republication of this famous work of Henry George. This is to be known as the FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY EDITION. The book carries a portrait of the author reproduced from the oil painting by Harry Thurston See, recently acquired by the Foundation. There is a notable explanatory "Foreword," as follows:

"The fame won by Henry George as writer, economist and philosopher, has not diminished with the years that have passed since his death in 1897. On the contrary, there has been a steadily broadening recognition of his intellectual eminence. Significant of this was the recent Appreciation by John Dewey, the famous American educator and professor of philosophy at Columbia University, which contained these striking statements:

" 'It would require less than the fingers of the two hands to enumerate those who, from Plato down, rank with Henry George among the world's social philosophers. . . . No man, no graduate of a higher educational institution, has a right to regard himself as an educated man in social thought unless he has some first-hand acquaintance with the theoretical contribution of this great American thinker.'

"In this fiftieth year after the first publication of "Progress and Poverty," it must appear to that growing body of workers for social justice who in many lands are spreading George's gospel, that there is at this time as great a need as ever for the comprehension of the truth he sought to make plain. For, as in 1879, there is widespread social unrest in the world. Industrial depression and unemployment are conditions common to many lands, and even in the nominally prosperous atmosphere of the United States, vast numbers are compelled to live in poverty or close to its border line. It would appear that in the half century since "Progress and Poverty" was published, there has been little abatement of the social and economic ills that have afflicted the human family everywhere, and that recur, with unfailing regularity, in cycles that seem unexplainable except to the followers of Henry George. And, at a time when world opinion is demanding that statesmanship shall outlaw war, it is important to recall that the World Economic Conference, held at Geneva in 1927 at the call of the League of Nations, found a definite interdependence of the economic causes of war and industrial depression. It seems like a vindication of the philosophy of Henry George to find that this Conference, to which the representatives of fifty nations were called, unanimously arrived at the conclusion that:

"The main trouble now is neither any material shortage of the resources of nature nor any inadequacy in man's power to exploit them. It is all, in one form or another, a maladjustment; not an insufficient productive capacity, but a series of impediments to the full utilization of that capacity. The main obstacles to economic revival have been the hindrances opposed to the free flow of labor, capital, and goods."

"This, in effect, is what Henry George maintained fifty years ago, contrary to the teachings of the accepted political economy.

"Greater need than ever exists for a re-examination by mankind of the remedy for the world's social and economic ills that is involved in the fundamental proposals of Henry George—proposals which Tolstoy declared must ultimately be accepted by the world because they are so logical and so unanswerable.

"Therefore, the Trustees of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation of New York, which was formed to bring about a wider acquaintance with the social and economic philosophy of Henry George, have considered this an appropriate time to produce from new plates this Fiftieth Anniversary Edition of "Progress and Poverty."

NOT since 1924 has there been anything like the politicians' enthusiasm for the farmer, and nothing like it will be seen again until 1932.

—Nashville Banner.

Oregon

J. R. HERMANN, of Portland, filed a thousand names to the Single Tax Petition on May 23rd, all of them secured by himself. It is his hope to rouse in Oregon the spirit of the Great Adventure which in California produced a record-breaking vote. He is ably assisted in the work by George Bylander, Louis Bowerman, S. L. Casto, R. D. Merchant and others of the faithful.

Some effective literature has been printed and circulated. An increased fare having been asked for by the company operating the transportation systems of Portland one of these circulars says that the main reasoning adding strength to this demand is that cars must travel past miles and miles of unimproved or half improved lots, and asks

WHY SHOULD WE:

Build miles and miles of paved streets past vacant lots?
 Build miles and miles of sewer pipe past vacant lots?
 Build miles and miles of gas mains past vacant lots?
 Build miles and miles of water mains past vacant lots?
 Run miles and miles of electric cables past vacant lots?
 Run miles and miles of telephone lines past vacant lots?
 Have the fire departments run miles and miles past vacant lots?

Have an army of policemen to guard and protect vacant lots?

The following resolutions have been passed by the Building Trades Council of Portland without a dissenting voice; and these have been referred to the Oregon State Federation of Labor which meets some time in August.

"Whereas:

The eternal Tax Muddle is ever present and further from solution than ever.

And Whereas:

A question is never settled until it is settled right.

And whereas:

The only scientific system of taxation and land reform ever presented to the world was presented by a workman, a printer, by the name of Henry George in his immortal work "Progress and Poverty" fifty years ago.

And Whereas:

Organized labor of Oregon has four times helped the Oregon Single Tax League to present the measure to the people of Oregon.

Therefore be it resolved:

That the Building Trades Council of Portland renews allegiance to the principle that all men have an equal right to the use of the earth and that human industry should not be taxed, to the end that the labor problem may reach final solution, and the world live in peace, we call upon the central labor council and the State Federation of Labor to bend every effort to finance and assist the Oregon Single Tax League to again submit the same measure that was submitted in 1920 and '22 and that all funds be sent to

Ben Osborn, secretary of the State Federation of Labor, Labor Temple, Oregon, and that he be instructed to cooperate with the Oregon Single Tax League to the end that the petitions be circulated and a campaign waged."

The menace of the Single Tax has again aroused the opposition to the point of throwing additional difficulties around the Initiative and Referendum. The suggestion is made that signers to petitions visit the City Hall to sign. George Bylander commenting on this proposal has this to say in the Portland papers:

"There is just one bright star on the horizon, and that is the readiness by which the people sign the petitions, there seems to be an instinct among the masses that whether or not they understand the merits of the bill they sign, that every petition is a people's petition and that every act of the legislature is an expression of machine privilege.

No, the people will not walk to the court house to sign. That means to kill the I. R. Many of them will not even register or vote and if it were not for the petition shovers who initiate interest in public affairs in the public there would be less and less voters. Thank God, there are a few brave people who are willing to face the jeers of the haughty and powerful and the sneers of the ignorant mob and place the instrument of democracy before the people, that neither the ignorant rich nor the ignorant poor may sweep us to any great extreme and the ideals of American democracy may live.

This is a sufficient answer to the complaint that petition-circulating is too easy.

Mr. Louis Bowerman is carrying on a debate with a Mr. Sommer, and in a letter to the *Journal*, of Portland, writes:

"The 'Single Tax' is misnamed. It is neither a tax on land nor 'land-value.' It proposes abolition of all taxes whatsoever and to appropriate space-rent, exclusively, which is always proportionate to the population surrounding, who set up a demand for use of any given space. Space-rent equals the advantage-value its occupant may enjoy over the occupant of the least advantageous space. A million dollar acre-space offers a million times more advantage or opportunity than a dollar acre-space and the respective rentals would be as a million to one. Since every citizen occupies space, each would contribute to or compensate, society in proportion as he was advantaged or benefitted by society."

Following is the amendment to be voted on March 1st, 1931, if sufficient signers to the petition are secured.

"Section 1 of Article IX of the Constitution of the State of Oregon shall be and hereby is amended to read as follows: Section 1. From March, 1, 1931, to and until March 1, 1935, all revenues necessary for the maintenance of state, county, municipal and district government shall be raised by a tax on the value of land, irrespective of improvements in or on it, and thereafter the full rental value of land, irrespective of improvements, shall be taken in lieu of all other taxes for the maintenance of government, and for such other purposes as the people may direct. All pro-

visions of the Constitution and Laws of Oregon in conflict with this section are hereby abrogated and repealed in so far as they conflict herewith, and this section is self-executing."

Henry George Foundation Aids Denver Single Tax Campaign

BELIEVING that the example of Pittsburgh would serve to stimulate interest and enlist greater support for the Single Tax amendment submitted to the voters of Denver on May 21st, William N. McNair, President of the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh and recent Democratic nominee for United States Senator, traveled to Denver early in May for the special purpose of participating in the campaign led by Barney Haughey. Mr. McNair went as a representative of the Henry George Foundation and did very effective work during the week that he spent in Colorado. Among the organizations which he addressed on this speaking tour were the Denver City Club, the Builders Exchange, the Taxation Committee of the Chamber of Commerce and the Allied Labor Council. In addition to these engagements, he also delivered three radio addresses and spoke before smaller labor groups and at outdoor meetings.

A rather remarkable incident in connection with Mr. McNair's trip was written up very appropriately by Frank C. Harper, columnist of the "Pittsburgh Press". In response to a letter from Pittsburgh offering the services of Mr. McNair, the Secretary of the Denver Real Estate Exchange telegraphed that his organization was "exceedingly anxious" to have the speaker address their luncheon on May 15th and this telegram was duly confirmed by letter. In the meanwhile, however, some representatives of the landed interests apparently got busy and the following telegram of cancellation was received by Secretary Williams a few days later:

"Since wiring our members have voiced disapproval of any system eliminating taxes on personalty or lessening taxes on improvements. Necessary we cancel arrangements for McNair's talk. Please advise him. Sorry."

While the measure submitted to the voters of Denver was not a very radical proposal, involving only the exemption of improvements in so far as city taxes were concerned by gradual steps over a period of ten years, it brought forth a bitter editorial attack by the *Denver Post* and the campaign apparently aroused pretty strong feelings in certain quarters. Nevertheless, Mr. McNair met with a very cordial reception wherever he appeared and reported that quite a number of business men, as well as representatives of the labor element, had expressed themselves favorably and seemed quite ready to admit that Denver would do well to follow Pittsburgh's lead and go even further by adopting the measure submitted which would completely exempt improvements from city taxes.

The amendment voted on May 24 resulted in 6,000 for, to 30,000 against. All amendments were defeated.

Barney Haughey writes:

"We think we have learned a great deal in this campaign and in the next few days I will prepare a letter to all of our friends telling them what we have learned and what our plans for the future will be."

The Henry George Congress

JUBILEE CELEBRATION TO ATTRACT MANY PROMINENT SINGLE TAXERS

K EEN interest is already being evinced by prominent single taxers in all sections of the country in the approaching Jubilee Celebration at the Fourth Annual Henry George Congress, scheduled for Pittsburgh, September 23d to 25th. In commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of "Progress and Poverty," the Convention Committee is planning to issue to the delegates attractive badges with a bronze or gold plated medal designed especially for this occasion, which will make a very desirable souvenir.

Having uppermost in mind the attendance goal of five hundred, an unusually large and representative Convention Committee has been named this year and every effort will be exerted by the Committee to bring to Pittsburgh good delegations from all sections of the United States. The National Convention Committee, William N. McNair, Pittsburgh, Pa., Chairman, has been appointed, with the following persons as members:

Henry Ware Allen, Wichita, Kan.; Herbert C. Allen, Asheville, N. C.; Will Atkinson, Capon Springs, W. Va.; Warren Worth Bailey, Jr., Johnstown, Pa.; Henry P. Boynton, Cleveland, Ohio; Katherine E. Bradley, Olean, N. Y.; Andrew P. Canning, Chicago, Ill.; Alfred N. Chandler, Newark, N. J.; Miss Joan Chaffe, New Orleans; Dr. S. Solis Cohen, Philadelphia; Grace Isabel Colbron, New Canaan, Conn.; Thomas B. Craig, Colorado Springs, Colo.; W. L. Crosman, Revere, Mass.; Otto Cullman, Chicago, Ill.; Samuel Danziger, Baltimore, Md.; J. H. Dillard, Charlottesville, Va.; Mark M. Dintenfass, Palisade, N. J.; George H. Duncan, East Jaffrey, N. H.; Charles R. Eckert, Beaver, Pa.; James B. Ellery, Erie, Pa.; Hon. Oliver T. Erickson, Seattle, Wash.; Clayton J. Ewing, Chicago, Ill.; James C. Fuller, Kansas City, Mo.; Frank W. Garrison, Southwest Harbor, Me.; Charles H. Ingersoll, East Orange, N. J.; Frederick F. Ingram, Detroit, Mich.; Emil O. Jorgensen, Chicago, Ill.; Gerrit J. Johnson, Los Angeles, Cal.; Grace A. Johnston, Berkely, Cal.; Ervin Kauffman, St. Louis, Mo.; G. Frank Kelly, Scottdale, Pa.; Fenton Lawson, Cincinnati, O.; J. C. Lincoln, Cleveland, O.; Herman G. Loew, New York City; Robert C. Macauley, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mary Holmes Martin, Chicago, Ill.; A. J. Mulligan, San Francisco, Cal.; Frederick H. Monroe, Chicago, Ill.; John M.

Moore, Lancaster, Pa.; James F. Morton, Paterson, N. J.; John S. McLean, Columbus, Ohio; John Emery McLean, Fairhope, Ala.; Fay Lewis, Rockford, Ill.; Joseph Dana Miller, New York City; Mark Millikin, Hamilton, Ohio; John Lawrence Monroe, Chicago, Ill.; Charles J. Ogle, Baltimore, Md.; Harry W. Olney, Washington, D. C.; Chester C. Platt, Rye, N. Y.; James H. McGill, Valparaiso, Ind.; Billy Radcliffe, Cleveland, Ohio; Ray Robson, Lansing, Mich.; Charles B. Rogers, Fort Atkinson, Wis.; Jennie A. Rogers, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Charlotte Schetter, New York City; Alex Y. Scott, Rosedale, Miss.; Henry G. Seaver, Westfield, N. J.; George J. Shaffer, Los Angeles, Cal.; Mrs. Roswell Skeel, Jr., Vineyard Haven, Mass.; Bolton Smith, Memphis, Tenn.; Walter G. Stewart, Reading, Pa.; Frank Stephens, Arden, Del.; Frank T. Stirlith, Edgemoor, Del.; Hon. S. A. Stockwell, Minneapolis, Minn.; Harold Sudell, Philadelphia, Pa.; Lucy Swanton, Washington, D. C.; Ambrose H. Swope, Johnstown, Pa.; Alan C. Thompson, Toronto, Canada; Henry L. Tideman, Chicago, Ill.; N. A. Vyne, Camp Verde, Ariz.; Oliver McKnight, Philadelphia, Pa.; Paul de Moll, Philadelphia, Pa.; Edward White, Kansas City, Mo.; Harry H. Willock, Lillian, Ala.; August Williges, Sioux City, Iowa.

The local Convention Committee, upon whom will fall the duty of carrying through the local arrangements, for the gathering, consists of the following, all of whom are affiliated with the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh, which is actively cooperating with a view to making the Congress a great success:

Prof. J. B. Alemany, Ward Bonsall, Janet L. Brownlee, A. J. Demnler, Walter R. Demnler, H. B. Emigh, William B. Foster, Dr. F. E. Luke, John M. Henry, G. Brown Hill, C. V. Horn, George P. Loomis, John Mellor, Paul G. McClelland, B. B. McGinnis, W. S. McMahan, M. McNeill, Hugo W. Noren, E. W. Pittman, Charles A. Poth, Mark F. Roberts, William Robinson, Harry G. Samson, William E. Schoyer, William Scott, Cornelius D. Scully, Ralph E. Smith, Mrs. Wallace Stewart, Sidney A. Teller, David J. Terry, John W. Treiber, Carl Van der Voort, William J. Van Essen, George W. Wakefield.

Departing somewhat from the practice at the previous annual gatherings, it is planned to feature at Pittsburgh the *Conference* idea. Aside from the public meeting and the annual banquet and luncheons, the sessions will be largely devoted to intimate discussions of vital problems, of policy and method, with a minimum of formal addresses. An opportunity will be given, however, for the Conference to hear, at least briefly, from most of the leading figures in the Single Tax movement, many of whom have already assured the Committee of their purpose to attend. As quite a number of the official members of the Henry George Foundation, including President George E. Evans, will attend the International Conference at Edinburgh, the Henry George Congress will be favored with reports cover-

ing the very latest first-hand news with regard to the more important developments in the international field.

The Greater William Penn Hotel, which is described as the largest hotel in the world outside of New York and Chicago, was thrown open to the public on May 8th. Needless to say it will afford admirable facilities for the Conference, and the rates quoted for Convention guests are fortunately quite reasonable. At this date the Convention program is in a very tentative form, but detailed information will soon be available and the regular Congress invitations will be issued from the Pittsburgh headquarters of the Henry George Foundation during the month of June.

James F. Morton at Schuylerville, N. Y.

A LOT was learned by those who knew something about Single Tax on land values at the Single Tax dinner meeting in the Masonic Temple last evening; something was learned by those who knew nothing about it; and the memories of those who both knew something and knew nothing of the subject, were refreshed when James F. Morton, curator of the Paterson, N. J., museum and strong advocate for the universal trial of the tax theory, and a few local and out-of-town questioners presented the Henry George proposition to a gathering numbering upwards of seventy, including men and women.

Mr. Morton is a convincing speaker and his listeners were well entertained and instructed in the session that started just before 8 o'clock and continued until well after 10.

Dr. T. E. Bullard had brought the speaker to the community and had made arrangements with the committee, comprising J. B. Deyoe, J. H. Fake and T. Kenneth Bullard, for the excellent dinner served by Mrs. John T. Campbell, proprietress of the Campbell Tea Room.

Dr. Bullard sat at the speaker's table with the guest of the evening. The doctor is a well-known local adherent of Single Tax.

Curator Morton presented in rapid order many items of interest in regard to Single Tax, touching upon its misunderstanding, the taking off of taxes by its adoption, calling it the only method of collecting social revenue, and dwelling upon the union of activities making for strength in relation to united efforts along Single Tax lines.

Further, he spoke of the steps in the progress of life, depicting various stages of development, the justification for the state, the imperfections in the development of society through the ages, the different forms of government, proving that representative government is the highest type, and then going into the matter of religious freedom in the state, the cramping of the individual in his development, taxation and rights of society, raising taxes because of industry, and other analogous subjects bearing on the justification for Single Tax.

A Preposterous Canard

PROGRESS of the Single Tax idea will be reviewed at a meeting at Edinburg this summer of an international body formed to advocate the principle.

That it is holding its own in territory where it was adopted long ago, but that not much new territory has been invaded for some years, will probably be indicated by the representation at the gathering in which twenty-six countries are invited to take part. More than a quarter of a century ago the favor with which it had been received in New Zealand and Australia was repeatedly cited for the encouragement of its champions. It still has a vogue there and, as was, perhaps, to be expected, the new capital of the Australian Federation, Canberra, obtains its revenue from this form of taxation. Introduced in South America, it has made some progress in Uruguay and Brazil, forms a plank in the platform of one political party in Argentina and has some prevalence in the Transvaal in Africa.

For the most part, it seems to be utilized under optional sanction in local taxation, and Denmark is said to be the first country resorting to it in national taxation, though recognition for taxing the "unearned increment" seems to be given in a clause of the German Republic's Constitution, declaring that "increase in land values not due to expenditure of capital and labor must be used for community benefit."

Compared, however, with the advance predicted for it a quarter of a century ago, the principle remains virtually static. There was a time in the United States when an academic belief in the Single Tax was included among the articles of faith of everybody with the slightest claim to progressive and liberal thought in public affairs. In the case of some men it was the only point on which such a claim could ever be based and a vague confidence that it was the "coming thing" permeated to all classes of society.

A magnate of large wealth, who included it among his publicly catalogued convictions, once had occasion to buy up a two-thirds majority in both houses of a central western state's legislature, in insuring the defeat of a measure opposed by big business. The happy thought came to him that before releasing his hold he might do something for his pet reform fad and the ultimate regeneration of society by instructing his lobbyists to jam a sweeping Single Tax measure through his purchased legislative bodies as soon as his major bill was out of the way.

The Single Tax got through one house with an immediate effect clause and through the Committee of the Whole in the other, with an overwhelming vote, when the realty interests of important cities heard about it and swooped down on the capital in swift special trains, the triumphant forward movement in uplift being permanently arrested. This was the farthest point ever reached in any state of the Union by a Single Tax proposal of state-wide effect.

Even the man who, without knowing a thing about it, used always to say, "Yes, of course, I think the Single Tax a good thing, but—" has almost disappeared. Once the subject of prodigious discussion in all its intricacies and phases by men who did know all about it, the Single Tax now receives even mention only occasionally.

—*St. Louis Globe Democrat.*

The Landlord Gets The Benefit

HENRY GEORGE would have chuckled to read a recent financial item of news from New York.

The Chrysler people are putting up a 68-story skyscraper in that city, on ground leased from the Cooper Union.

Seventy years ago, because of the educational and charitable work of that organization, the New York legislature exempted its property from taxation.

But though the city gets *no taxes* from the Chrysler company, that concern, according to the *New York Times*, *must pay a sum practically equivalent to the taxes to the owners of the ground*—the Cooper Union.

Henry George insisted that any reduction or exemption of land values from taxation profited the landlord alone, since he charged all the traffic would bear, anyway.

Here, a generation after the death of the great Single-Taxer, comes pretty strong evidence that he was right.

Labor, Washington, D. C.

Mexico

WE have received a fortnightly Review "MAN," from Mexico City. Its director is Engineer M. C. Rolland. This Review advocates the doctrines of Henry George and is the organ of the "Georgist Union" in the Mexican Capital. Its headquarters are at 444 Chapultepec Avenue, Mexico City.

Our Mexican brothers are developing an important campaign for the diffusion of the Georgist doctrine. They began in 1921 and are today more ardent than ever in their campaign. Under the very special conditions which this country is now going through, with its grave and unsolved agrarian problem, and with the important and delicate questions related to the foreign control of its petroleum resources, the activities of our Mexican friends may have very beneficial results in effecting a just and rational solution.

—*Georgist Tribune, Buenos Aires (Translation).*

A PENSION for ex-presidents is being advocated on the ground that it is beneath ex-presidential dignity to look for a job and take chances on being turned down. But what else does an ex-president deserve who while in office made no effort toward removing the cause of unemployment and poverty? The economic system which he considered good enough for his fellow-citizens ought to be good enough for him. —*American Economic League.*

Land Prices

THE management of a large group of foreclosed farms in the Middle West reports the sale this spring of more than a dozen farms at "profitable figures." Presumably this means at prices in excess of the equity in the farms plus the expense of carrying and maintaining them since their foreclosure. These prices were better than were offered a year ago.

The management of this particular group of farms believes that land prices are due to go higher. It believes also that they should.

"Land prices have been either declining or stationary for the past eight years," it states. "An upturn should not be far off. The supply of farm land cannot be increased without involving considerable time and cost. Meanwhile, farming conditions are growing better and the pressure of population is becoming greater in this country. Sometime in the future we shall probably look back and see that the land prices of the present represented a bargain."

In contrast with this opinion is another, perhaps best expressed by an Illinois landowner, who has three good farms.

"I believe it would be unfortunate for land prices to increase at present," he said. "That may sound strange, coming from a man who has most of his capital invested in land, but I am not looking at it exactly from a personal standpoint. Land prices are now at about the point where a good farmer can earn a fair rate of interest on the investment. If they advance, without an equivalent advance in the prices of farm products, it will only tend to provoke discouragement.

"In the case of rented farms the landowner would have to exact a higher rental to keep his returns in adjustment with the capital investment represented by his land. The young fellow now farming as a tenant, but who hopes some day to become a landowner, would see his hope moving farther away. Naturally he would become discouraged. Good tenants are not any too numerous now. We can hardly afford to reduce their number if we want our land farmed right.

"An increase in land values, too, would hinder the reorganization, now going on, of farms into units better adapted in size and situation to farming under the new conditions. Besides it would simply be an invitation to higher taxes, and we're paying about all we can stand now.

"I'm not sure, either, that the old process of advancing land values was so good for us as some think. It did not contribute to a permanent agriculture—rather it had an opposite effect. There was always the temptation to sell out and take the profit that had accumulated. It encouraged speculative buying of land by townspeople who had no intention of farming it themselves but bought it for

the same reason many have recently been buying stocks. Besides, there was always the danger of prices outrunning earning capacity, as they did in the war boom, with all the consequent grief.

"I'm inclined to think an attitude that looks more for profits in a well-planned use of land, rather than an increase in its value, is better for us. Of course, if the prices of farm products generally go up, probably nothing can be done to prevent the prices of good farm land increasing. But I don't believe anything should be done to stimulate that increase."

History in this country supports those who feel that land values should advance. The traditional American attitude toward agriculture accepted it as a good thing. In all likelihood that is the prevailing view today. Almost everyone likes to feel that his investment is increasing in value. But there is a growing disposition—the reasoning of the Illinois landowner is an example of it—to question some of the tendencies of agriculture and to apply to them the test of cause and effect. That also is a good thing.

—*The Country Gentleman*, for May.

Money in Abundance for the City's Needs

THE following letter from Frederic C. Leubuscher, addressed to the Merchants' Association of New York, explains itself:

"This is my first opportunity of answering Mr. Booth's letter of the 17th.

"He requests my suggestion for a solution of the financial problem confronting this City in relation to the transit, school, port of New York and other questions. All these improvements will require the expenditure of a half billion dollars at least, and, of course, the constitutional debt limit stands in the way. My suggestion will not add one dollar to our already enormous debt, nor will it entail the payment of any interest that will at least double the amount borrowed, thus mortgaging unborn generations.

"The assessed land values of New York City amount to about seven billions of dollars, the actual values probably being ten billions. Every cent of this value was made by the seven million people that are living and working in and around the City. In other words, the mere presence of the population makes the land values, so that they could be properly called 'People Values.' The annual ground rent, based on the rate charged by Trinity Church, Sailors Snug Harbor, the Astor Estate and other large land owners, is about 900 million dollars. The City actually collects of this sum about 200 millions. This leaves a margin of about 700 millions, all of it going to land owners who made only an infinitesimal part of the land value. If the City collected only one-third of the 700 millions and allowed the land owners to retain all the rest its financial problems would all be solved.

"Of course, this is the Single Tax. Whatever the name, the only questions a patriotic citizen should ask himself is—Is it just, is it feasible and will it produce the revenue? I am absolutely convinced that 'yes' is the correct answer to all the three questions."

Tolstoy and His Work

[EXTRACTS FROM ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CHARLES G. BALDWIN AT THE TOLSTOY CENTENARY HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE MARYLAND TAX REFORM ASSOCIATION]

CHARLES DICKENS (whom Tolstoy frequently quotes) portrayed the miseries and joys of poverty, and himself sought and obtained riches.

Tolstoy portrayed the miseries and joys of riches and himself sought poverty.

Henry George, acquainted with poverty by experience, sought wealth for all as distinguished from riches for any, and devised a practical method of attaining his object.

These three great philosophers agree in this—that our economic welfare is a matter of primary importance to our happiness.

Tolstoy recognized the soundness of the philosophy and method of Henry George.

Incidentally, all three of these great original thinkers and teachers recognized the wisdom, chivalry and meekness of one of the greatest of all poets, soldiers, and statesmen, David, King of Israel, who said, "Give me neither poverty nor riches, but feed me with food convenient for men."

In order to appraise the value of Tolstoy's views it may be helpful to consider for a moment his character as a man.

Henry George, being himself always a victim of poverty, might be charged with an unjustifiable bias against the rich, but Tolstoy, who was a rich man, is not open to this criticism. If Tolstoy condemns riches, it is not by reason of any envy of the rich, or the pinch of poverty.

No matter what form of government, if it fails to do its chief duty, it fails just as badly as any other form of government.

Tolstoy did not share the revolutionary zeal of those who opposed the arbitrary powers of the Czar.

He pointed out that Europe and America had succeeded in diminishing neither poverty nor excessive riches by changes in their form of government.

Tolstoy's life presents strange paradoxes upon the surface, but his influence is greatly increased when we examine these and find beneath only consistent growth and development in spite of a hostile environment.

Fruit trees planted in rocky soil give more fruit than those in rich soil.

Perhaps there is space to examine briefly a few of these paradoxes.

Tolstoy was descended from a friend of Peter the Great, was a petted nobleman with large estates and high rank, with access to the Czars, and he was a successful soldier in the greatest army then known, and yet he was a benignant anarchist.

He was rich by his own inheritance and by his own literary work, and yet he was a common laborer with his hands.

His anarchy is explained by his Christianity. His kingdom was not founded upon arbitrary power but upon the kingdom of service.

Tolstoy in his work, "A Great Iniquity," gives the history of taxation, and shows that any form of government might, if it would, collect the rent of land and expend it for the benefit of society. This is its chief service, and if it does more, it robs, and if it does less, it encourages theft.

In his view the world was one huge family, all men were brothers, and if some were enslaved and robbed none could rejoice, no matter how serviceable and wise might be his local government.

So his anarchy was benignant like that of Jesus when He broke the Sunday law and healed on the Sabbath, and when He failed to prosecute an adulterous woman.

Another Tolstoyan paradox was his love for manual labor. Here he seemed a better Christian than Christ. Paul could no longer practice law, because lawyers, as part of the boasted jurisprudence of Rome, had crucified Jesus. Paul must share the ostracism of all Christians, and he fell back on tent-making as a trade not inconsistent with Christianity. Jesus had raised religion and medicine above the pagan era of human sacrifice, and of all the learned professions that of the law refused then, as it does now, to follow his teaching.

Tolstoy had labored to free the serfs. He must labor to share their labors, to teach them how to find "the yoke that was easy and the burden that was light." When, behold, a great light shown around and about him, and he found that he could teach the manual laborer nothing. Birth, marriage, and death were no mystery to the manual laborer, and he, Tolstoy, a parasite, as he delighted to call himself, had to learn this manual labor and from laborers the answer to the riddles of Life. He, a parasite, must also sit in sackcloth and ashes for years of idleness. He found the roots of all art in the hearts of the peasants. Here was the answer to this paradox—Liberty for leisure is a call to labor.

He invited his wife and family to labor and to the same hope of immortality, and when they declined he gave them all of his ill-gotten gains, and, with no place to lay his head as an old man, marched out alone to face death as did Moses.

"Life's only happiness was in doing good for the whole world." This sums up Tolstoy.

You may say this wordly, sensual and violent youth having drunk life's sweets to the dregs leaves only its dregs of labor and lonesomeness for others.

The answer is "Yes, so it was," but he was a victim of unjust social conditions which forced unearned riches upon him and made him and the undeservedly poor a menace and burden to society, and he righted his own life at fearful cost and taught humanity how to save itself this suffering.

He was noble, rich, famous, honored, courted, petted, and beloved, and yet chose to be a plebeian, a laborer.

Yes, you say, but he had no anxiety because his wife was offered his riches for his benefit. How do you know? His tragic end indicates his sincerity. His deepest despair came from the charges that he wore a silk shirt under a laborer's smock.

Many artists have an artistic conscience. Tolstoy sought to make his artistic conscience coincide with his human conscience.

He does not betray his caste, but exalts it.

Anna Karenina stands beside the adulterous woman rescued by Jesus. Both women are beloved of all humanity. Both victims of an unjust system. Both marked with a grace which was borne of God, who is too pure to behold iniquity.

Just a word to call to witness the crowning beauty of Tolstoy's honesty and sincerity.

First, his power to depict nature. In every page which he wrote one is impressed with the superb beauty of his picture, its real realism as distinguished from artistic realism.

Second, his humor—so delicate as hardly to be traced in such characters as Oblensky the ineffectual, lovable, unworthy husband of Dolly. Old Count Rostof, always broke, like Mr. Micawber. Levin, who must provoke a smile much as did David Copperfield in his love for Dora, however sincere was that affection. And Pierre, a fine contrast on the battle field.

Third, his pathos, which far excels anything in literature. Even Charles Dickens pales somewhat in the stolen visit of Anna Karenina to her little son after she had deserted her husband.

It is such supreme powers as these—the love of nature, the gift of humor, the power of pathos, that are promised to all who will follow the straight and narrow path laid out by Henry George.

PEOPLE in the mass do not work out their economic or social problems. They are either too busy or too indifferent and so accept whatever fashionable opinion may be handed down to them. It is so much easier to run along with stylish ideas and so avoid the danger of being considered queer.

—Arizona Single Taxer.

SAID CHIEF KEMAH of the Arizona Mojaves, contemptuously, to a New York author of Indian lore, "Any desert in New York?" Experience taught the chief that the wide wastes are the only open spaces still free to human habitation and subsistence. Elsewhere, white and brown pay toll to a rapidly growing landed aristocracy who "saw it first." The Indian still lives up to Patrick Henry's religion of freedom and is singing the Death Chant.

—Arizona Single Taxer.

Two Towns' Tax Experiments

FOR many years the town of Takoma Park, Md., bordering on the District of Columbia, had assessed land at two-thirds of its value for taxation, and improvements at one-third. Personal property is entirely exempt. Recently an advance in the right direction was made. Land assessments have been increased to three-fourths and improvement assessments reduced to one-fourth. In the meantime the town has grown from an ordinary suburban development to a little city of 8,000 people.

Another wideawake place on the Washington border is Capitol Heights, Va. There all local taxes are laid on land values alone and the town is prospering.

With two such object lessons close at hand one would think Representatives and Senators who insist on managing Washington's local affairs and who deny the city home rule would learn a few lessons in statesmanship. But such does not seem to be the case. For all they know about it Takoma Park and Capitol Heights may be in China. If written to by some constituents perhaps they might be persuaded to observe some interesting and successful taxing experiments being made almost under their noses.

Real Commercial Statecraft

IT is a fundamental mistake to think that as a country we should produce everything we consume regardless of cost, or that we will have any more industry or employment for labor, create any more wealth or be more prosperous by doing so. On the contrary, the country will have more employment for labor and an industrial output of greater value if it will produce the commodities which it can produce most advantageously, and obtain what other commodities it wants by giving these in trade. The real question is not that of finding employment for labor, but of the most productive employment, measured in dollars and cents. It is by producing the highest net values that the country obtains the largest returns for labor and capital, and it is a misdirection of energy to employ either labor or capital otherwise.

The industries which are most valuable to a country are not those which must be fostered or supported permanently by legislative aid in the home market, but those which are able to compete in all the markets of the world, and which thus have the largest possibilities of expansion. The recent growth of our exports in all quarters, and particularly of manufactured exports, is proof that these possibilities are important. It is, however, a condition of world trade that we shall receive the products of other countries in exchange. The purchasing power of every country is in its own products.

There is an exaggerated fear of competition with low wage countries. A low wage country cannot drive a high

wage country out of business in any general sense. As a rule wages are low where labor is comparatively unproductive, either because it is unskilled or inexperienced or because it is not provided with the best class of equipment. Density of population—labor supply—also is a factor, but a country with a dense population will be a larger consuming country and cannot export largely without also importing largely. Every country in the long run must import as much as it exports, unless it is getting the worst of the trade or making permanent investments abroad. The industries of high wage and low wage countries will be naturally adjusted to each other, so as to be complementary rather than competitive, just as there are employments for high wage and low wage labor in the same country. There is plenty of work for all the labor in the world, of all grades and rate of pay, and there is gain to every class in exchange with the other classes. Moreover, nothing can be more foolish than to apply high class labor to low class work of production which for any reason can be more economically done in some other place, even though that place is in another country.—GEORGE E. ROBERTS in *Monthly Bulletin* of the National City Bank of New York.

Ashley Mitchell

"LIBERALISM means the abolition of all privilege, and the attainment of equal political and economic liberty for all, irrespective of class."

If we are seeking potted policies from our candidates, we could have nothing more definite, nor reasonable, than this declaration of Mr. Ashley Mitchell, taken from a recent newspaper article by him.

The statement adequately sums up Mr. Mitchell's outlook—no recognition of privilege, but liberty, political and economic, for all, no matter what their station in life. It would be hard to define a fairer policy than that in so few words; it would be equally hard to find a better exponent of the policy than Mr. Mitchell. Not content merely to propound sound ideas, he is a man who, despite the calls of business, has sufficient interest in the cause of social and political progress to fight for them on the platform. Penitence willing, he hopes soon to be able to do his share in Parliament in putting them into operation. Of his ability to take a share in the national administration there is no doubt. He is an able speaker, concise and always practical, and one who does not confuse issues.

He is an enthusiastic advocate of the taxation of land values, and has taken a leading part in the Yorkshire campaigns in connection with Land Values movement, having been chairman of the Yorkshire Land Values League since 1921 and treasurer of the International Union for Land Values Taxation.

Yorkshire (Eng.) *Observer*.

Enter the Single Tax

IN the *Monitor* of January 3, 1929, you published an interesting letter headed "Enter the Single Tax," referring to the inequity of present methods of taxation.

Your correspondent makes out a good case in favor of taking taxes off industry and enterprise, and placing them instead upon special privilege—i. e., upon the value which attaches to land by reason of the growth and development of communities in nation, state and municipality. This value is induced not only by the fact of the presence and material development of increasing populations, but by all those desirable elements that go to make for the "fuller" and more varied life—the ideal factors which someone has termed the "imponderables." Does not such a value accrue to the community rather than to the individual?

The present cumbersome, wasteful and inadequate methods of imposing and collecting the public revenues, with their ill-effect upon both Capital and Labor, must surely give way to a more accurate method; and given the postulate that there is a method that is just and right because it measurably conforms to natural economic law, it is clearly the duty, nay, the necessity, of self-governing peoples to find and apply it. The plea of the "Single Taxer" is for honest investigation and research.

A communication of this kind can, of course, barely touch upon so large a theme, but to anyone who may be further interested, a recent publication, "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty" by Henry George, compiled by Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown, of University of Missouri, with an appreciation of Henry George by Prof. John Dewey of Columbia University, is recommended. This is an inexpensive but well printed booklet which will repay anyone in interest and information upon what has heretofore been regarded as a "dry" subject.

—O. A. TOEPFERT, in *Christian Science Monitor*.

IF there is no better reason for the existence of the human race than the creation and accumulation of wealth which ultimately will pass under the control of the acquisitive one-half of one per cent of the population it might as well perish and let the earth relapse into the hands of its Creator.

—Editorial *Omaha World-Herald*.

THAT grinding sound you hear is the gnashing of teeth by all the realtors who thought they were going to sell Marion Talley a farm.—F. P. A. in *New York World*.

SAID the late James J. Hill: "Land without people is a desert. People without land are a mob." He might have added that the way to make deserts is to maintain a tax system which encourages withholding of land from use and discourages its use, the kind of tax system, it might be said, advocated by "professional economists," like Seligman or Ely.

A Back Number Theory Urged by a Farm Writer

A WRITER in the *National Farm News* in speaking of taxation offers this suggestion: "Somelhow the burden must be shifted to those who are able to pay, and the ability-to-pay rests wholly with those who have a net income."

Which proves that all people do not learn from experience. Farmers as well as persons in other occupations have had enough experience with efforts to enforce the ability-to-pay theory to learn that it is impractical. In some places they have learned it, as in Western Canada and in North Dakota, but throughout the United States generally this is not the case. The writer quoted does not seem to know that if the government really performs useful services the ones to pay therefor are those who get the benefits. If it performs no useful service, then no one should pay or be required to pay. In either case there is no excuse for taking money from anyone on the ground that he can afford it. If the government by any act puts money in a citizen's pocket which he has not earned through any act of his own, that citizen will be a beneficiary of what the government has done and, whatever his net income may be, should bear the expense. Wherever the government gives useful service there this service causes an increase in land values. Residents of such localities who own no land pay for these services in increased rents to landowners. To tax them is to make them pay a second time in taxes for the same service already paid for in rent. A tax on land values only is the only equitable way to defray the cost of such services. Should the government's acts cause no increase in land values then these acts must either be unnecessary or harmful and should be stopped. In neither case is the ability-to-pay theory justified.

The *National Farm News* writer should wake up. Otherwise we may find him writing some day an article of the urgent need of suppressing witchcraft, or that Spain be driven out of Cuba or the need of woman suffrage or something else that is just as up to date as the ability-to-pay doctrine.

—*American Economic League*, Baltimore, Md.

BOOK NOTICES

K. P. ALEXANDER DROPS INTO VERSE

"If You Must Talk" is the title of a 43-page pamphlet containing what the author calls in his sub-title "Some Metrical Cullings From the Years," and is from our old friend, K. P. Alexander, of Little Rock, Ark.

These verses are intellectual and philosophical rather than imaginative. But they are at least thought-provoking. The author has not brushed aside the problems of life for easy contentment, but has submitted them to profound questioning.

J. D. M.

JORGENSEN'S HAMMER BLOW

We have received a pamphlet of some 26 pages in stiff covers from Emil O. Jorgensen consisting of an "open letter" from that gentleman to Supt. William J. Bogan, of the Chicago Public Schools, giving reasons why the "Elementary Principles of Economics," by Ely and Wicker, should be excluded from the public schools of Chicago. The Ely and Wicker text is also being used in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Memphis, Milwaukee and many other large American cities.

Mr. Jorgensen has presented an amazing series of contradictions between the present teachings of Prof. Ely and those contained in his earlier works. And while one may change his opinions, and should not on that account be open to charges of corruption or inconsistency, such a complete reversal is almost without parallel. And on this account we hail this pamphlet, and indeed the entire work carried on by Messrs. Cullman and Jorgensen, as a useful contribution to the discussion that has been aroused, and is now becoming nation-wide, concerning the Ely Institute and the growing perception of its close affiliation with the real estate interests and the public utility corporations.

Opposite the title page of this very instructive pamphlet are important resolutions condemning the Ely Institute, from the Chicago Federation of Men Teachers, the National League of the Teachers' Association and the American Federation of Labor.

An interesting feature of the pamphlet are Exhibits A and B. These are reproductions of newspaper articles linking the Ely Institute with the great public service corporations—and reinforcing the argument by pictorial examples which appeal to the eye concerning the nature of this evil alliance.

Copies of this pamphlet may be had at 20 cents each from Emil O. Jorgensen, or from this office.

J. D. M.

" MIDDLETOWN "

Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York. Price \$5.00.

Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, the compilers of the mass of civic information given to the world under the title of "Middletown," have rendered a conspicuous service to all those who, from various viewpoints, are endeavoring to comprehend the meaning of the ominous phenomenon which we call civilization, and to determine whether there is any possible device which can be utilized to forestall the catastrophe in which it seems destined to terminate.

The life of a medium size American community is here laid open with a thoroughness never before seriously attempted. The fact should be kept in mind that the period during which the facts were gathered is the period during which prosperity reached such high water levels that the undisputed figures aroused the jealousy of an awe-struck and open-mouthed world, whose inhabitants could not understand why a population, all but a negligible minimum of whom were "millionaires," should insist upon the repayment of debts incurred in the triumphant struggle to "make the world safe for democracy," a phrase which we certainly invented, even if we did not exemplify.

What light does "Middletown" throw on the per capita prosperity of our urban population? We have already Secretary of Labor Davis' estimate that fourteen per cent of us are rich and eighty-six per cent of us are poor, and in the latter class he is understood to include only those whose wages or incomes fall below the minimum determined by official census figures as the lowest sum under present costs of living that a family can support itself in moderate comfort. And it must be remembered that Secretary Davis was not trying to make too low an estimate of American prosperity.

In the chapter entitled "The Long Arm of the Job" occurs the following significant passage: "For the seven out of every ten of those gainfully employed who constitute the working class, getting a living means being at work in the morning anywhere between six-fifteen and seven-thirty o'clock, chiefly seven."

It is hard to deny, however, that the main impression created by the book is one of futility. Details of life are reported with scrupulous

fidelity. But trends are baffling and the authors so indicate. That they are incapable of indicating direction may be inferred, even somewhat reluctantly, from the fact that in the twelve-page index the following words do not appear: "Land," "Land Value," "Rent," "Tenancy," "Landlord;" nor is there any reference to the fact that in a town of the size of Middletown there is a parasitic class, small in number but great in influence and wealth, which exists by virtue of the power it possesses to decide as to the terms upon which the remainder of the people of Middletown shall be permitted to work and live.

How do we know that they are there if the book does not tell us so? We know because all the concomitants of such a class are there—poverty, anxiety, disemployment and cramped lives, cowering in an atmosphere of apprehension and discouragement.

Nevertheless, despite the blindness of the authors to this most important factor in urban life, "Middletown" is worth any thoughtful person's perusal if only to show the underlying factors in such a community at the time of the apex of the prosperity of the United States.

J. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

FROM RABBI SILVER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Let me thank you most sincerely for your very appreciative review of my little book "Justice and Judaism" which appeared in the current number of your splendid publication "Land and Freedom," marked copy of which you were so good as to forward to me and which I received and read with intense appreciation. I wish also to acknowledge your very kind letter dated April 17th, 1929. It was indeed very gracious of you to have taken the trouble to write to me.

I am very familiar with the Henry George's immortal book "Progress and Poverty," which I have read a number of years ago, though I have not as yet read his "Social Problems." Had I read the latter book before writing my book, I certainly would have availed myself of that profound and beautiful quotation on justice which you so aptly quoted in your review. It certainly does reinforce my main thesis strongly.

Justice being our fundamental social ideal, it has seemed to me for a long time that among the outstanding means for effectively striving toward the realization of this socially redeeming ideal are the Single Tax, so immortally taught by Henry George, and the Co-operative Movement, which has been so ably described recently by Prof. James Warbasse in his "Cooperative Democracy."

After what appears as mankind's inevitable prior experiments in State Socialism and Communism, it seems to me, that as soon as the results of those experiments become apparent an increasing number of thoughtful people will sooner or later decide upon the two aforementioned means as the best practicable methods of attaining the equally important ideals of general economic welfare and individual freedom. A universal sufficiency of "bread" alone is not enough. A universal sufficiency of real freedom for the individual is equally important for man's complete welfare. The last mentioned important good, to my mind, the Socialistic State cannot assure us. In fact judging by our current Soviet experiment (which, needless to say, has our sympathy and interest), the Socialist State does not find the latter good at all important! And certainly it is as true today as it has always been that man cannot live by bread alone . . .

N. Y. City, N. Y.

MAXWELL SILVER.

WITH US TO STAY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Perennially complaints bob up about the name "Single Tax" with demands that it be changed. The complaints are unwarranted. It can not be changed. The name is good. It can be depended on to stick. Everybody knows that "Single Tax" means "Henry George,"

and we want it repeated until it arouses curiosity enough to cause people to read Henry George to find out what it is all about.
 iske, Mo. S. TIDEMAN.

WASHINGTON URGED AS A CENTER OF AGITATION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

There is no city in the country where an idea can be distributed as economically as in Washington. The Telephone Directory lists 500 associations with single party line. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce maintains a conspicuous store, and other cities well equipped offices, because that is a fact.

There is one educational endeavor of more importance and consequence than all the others together and the nearest suggestion of it to be found at the information booth is the address of a man named Singleton. There is a Woman's Single Tax Club here that deserves considerable praise, although it is not very much in evidence and as an educational factor amounts to but little. One could learn nothing about Single Tax here by casual inquiry.

Reforms galore here are sending out press notices and printed matter, most of it being of no importance economically, but the Reform that will make other reforms possible is almost unknown in Washington. Moreover, there is no city in the country that can be so easily and conspicuously exhibited as an example of faulty taxation. Five thousand people, representing every nook and corner of the country visit Washington every month, sometimes twice as many, sightseeing, and one of the sights they ought to see is a sign of Single Tax activity.

I want some signs, as Mr. Painter suggested in the last issue, in and about Washington, but I want radical signs in harmony with our radical proposition. Moreover, I want a headquarters as a source of information for the curious or the interested. The signs would read:
 The Single Tax. Stands for Economic Righteousness. Bureau of Information at So-and-So.

Single Tax Is the Reform That Will Make Other Reforms Possible. Bureau of information at So-and-So.

All Opposition to the Single Tax Is Founded on Greed or Ignorance. To Profess Goodness and Ignore or Ridicule or Oppose the Single Tax is to Acknowledge Ignorance, or Worse.

That's good advertising. It would attract attention, insure comment, stimulate interest. It's ethically true and we can hold our own logically. We must have an audience, and to get one we must "start something," and out of it we will win some logical young people to "carry on."

Washington, D. C.

J. B. CHAMBERLAIN.

WHERE WEALTH ACCUMULATES AND MEN DECAY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I consider your paper ably edited and it is steadily pointing the way to a better civilization—if only the common people would use their intelligence and find the way in which the workers can unwind themselves from the "stake of Land Monopoly" and thereby lighten the terrible load on their backs! The accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few in the States, as in Canada, goes on apace, and as the poet said many years ago,

"Ill fares that land, to hastening ills a prey,
 Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

Toronto, Canada.

W. R. WILLIAMS.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

JAMES R. BROWN, president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, has sent out a condensed transcript of his speaking tours for March and April. Lecture dates include 24 universities, 21 colleges and high schools, 14 service and business clubs, a total of 64 for the two months. Among the educational institutions addressed were Johns Hopkins, St. John's College, State Normal School and Polytechnic Institute, all of Maryland; the Washington and Lee University, University of

Richmond and College of William and Mary, Virginia, and Wellesley College and Boston University of Massachusetts. High schools, Rotary Clubs, and business organizations make up the total—a very impressive showing.

WE have received copy in pamphlet form of the deed of trust of the Henry George Foundation of Australia. The Foundation was established last July by a gift of £20,000 from Dr. Edgar William Culley. The Foundation is not an active propagandist body, but rather a receiving and distributing agency. The deed of gift provides that only the income from the Foundation shall be expended, the Fund remaining intact. It is just now promoting a competitive essay contest among students of the various Australian universities. Mr. W. H. Renwick, whose visit to New York is elsewhere chronicled, is president of the Foundation, and P. J. Markham secretary. The home of the Foundation is 18 George Parade, Melbourne, Victoria. There are 21 trustees, all well known men in the Georgan movement, selected from each of the Australian states.

THE indefatigable P. W. Schwander, of Houston, Texas, has suggested to the Henry George Foundation the issuing of postal cards to advertise the Single Tax, these to contain short statements of our principles on the front of the card, with space reserved for a short written message, and the back of the card used for quotations from prominent men on the land question, taxation, etc. This is not a new idea, of course, it having been done before by Morris Van Veen and others. Mr. Schwander gives examples of proposed cards with quotations from William Pitt, Thomas Jefferson, Cardinal Manning and others.

A WIDELY circulated weekly periodical of England is *John Blunt*. In its issue of May 11 appears an article from the pen of our friend, J. W. Graham Peace, entitled "Conscript the Land—Politicians of all Parties Playing With the Briton's Birthright—Restoration the Only Real Remedy." Concluding his very vigorous and excellent article, Mr. Peace says:

"As in 1916, on the plea of 'national necessity,' men were taken to save the land, so now we demand that the rent of the land shall be taken to save the men. If men could be 'deemed' to have been enlisted, the land can be deemed to be restored and its holders—there are no 'owners' in law, be it remembered!—be called upon to pay their rent."

JOSEPH DANA MILLER's "Thirty Years of Verse Making" is being read by the Princess Alice of Greece, whose conversion to the doctrines of Henry George and her reasons for their adoption were noted in March-April LAND AND FREEDOM. Another reader of Mr. Miller's poems is a lady in far-away Pitcairn, the romantic history of which distant island has fascinated many a student of its history, for here occurred an experiment in social and economic equality which was the wonder of visiting naval officers for more than a century.

WE acknowledge a very pleasant visit from two young ladies, Miss Ely Wright and Miss Adele Seay, friends of the daughter of Sir George Fowlds, of New Zealand. These young ladies will become students of the Dietetic Department of the Fifth Avenue Hospital, this city, and both are charming young ladies whose visit to this office was highly enjoyable.

THE pamphlet recently issued from this publication office, "Honest Farm Relief," by Harry Gunnison Brown, has been mailed to a large number of members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

COL. J. M. T. PARTELLO (U. S. Army, Retired), a friend of the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM, is contributing a series of interviews with the *San Francisco News*. Col. Partello is one of the two last surviving

participants in the Custer "debacle." He refuses to call it a massacre. "The land was theirs by treaty rights and we were invaders," he writes us. And so the truth of history slowly emerges, and the land question is again in evidence.

HAROLD SUDELL, of Chester, Pa., is a regular contributor of Single Tax letters to the Philadelphia *Record* and Philadelphia *Ledger*.

CARY RICHARD COLBURN, of San Diego, Cal., is now in Japan.

We have received announcement of a "Get Together Dinner" held on May 30th, in Philadelphia, under the auspices of the Henry George Lecture Association, at which Frederick H. Monroe, Senator William J. Ogden, Robert C. Macaulay and John Lawrence Monroe spoke. Henry W. Hetzel was toastmaster.

OUR valued contemporary *Progress*, of Melbourne, Australia, appears for the month of April in eight-page form.

THE report of the Maryland Tax Reform Association is before us. It recounts the stalling in committee of the association's bill for home rule in taxation in Baltimore, such as has been granted to all other cities and towns in the state. Hearings were given to groups representing the Real Estate Board as well as to the Maryland Tax Reform Association. But the bill was allowed to die in committee. Efforts will not be relaxed to secure its passage, however. Charles G. Baldwin is president and Charles J. Ogle secretary of the Maryland Tax Reform Association.

THE mother of our Charles LeBaron Goeller, Mrs. Sarah Goeller, celebrated her 87th birthday on May 18th, and our lecturer returned from his trip for a brief stay to celebrate the event.

THE *Standard*, of Sydney, New South Wales, reports the disappearance at sea of a well-known Single Taxer, once a subscriber to this paper, E. J. Hayes, who had been on a visit to New Zealand and was returning from Auckland to Sydney. On Sunday evening March 17th, he had conversed with other passengers on the *Mirama* and was apparently in good spirits. On Monday morning he was missing and his bed had not been slept in during the night. The Captain ordered an immediate search, but no trace of the missing man was found. Mr. Hayes was at one time a leading Sydney publisher, a member of the firm known as the Hayes Brothers, afterward the Law Book Company of Australasia, Ltd. His connection with the Henry George movement went back forty years and he was a good friend of the Single Tax League of New South Wales, supporting the movement with liberal contributions. The Henry George League of New South Wales passed appropriate resolutions.

REVIEWING the recent work of Mrs. Emily E. F. Skeel in three volumes on Parson Weems, noted in March-April LAND AND FREEDOM, the New York *Tribune*, in its issue of May 12th, says: "Nothing could have been more fitting as a memorial to Paul Leicester Ford, a shining figure in American letters, than this extension of one of his own products and its embodiment in noble typographical form." This is well said.

MARK M. DINTENFASS appears prominently with letters on the water supply of New Jersey in a number of papers in his section of that state.

THE Chicago *Tribune* of recent date prints a quite lengthy article entitled "Ely's Book Assailed as Propaganda," in which both Ely and Emil Jorgensen are liberally quoted.

"I ENJOYED LAND AND FREEDOM very much," writes Adolph Matza a new subscriber from Boston, Mass.

THE Schuylerville, N. Y., *Standard* contains a rather good notice of the address delivered at that place to about seventy-five persons by our old friend James F. Morton. The event is noted elsewhere in this issue.

OUR esteemed contemporary *The Square Deal*, of Toronto, Canada, will hereafter appear as a monthly. Our congratulations!

IN view of the sympathetic interest evinced by the Prince of Wales in the condition of the miners and his remark, "I am deeply touched by what I have seen of the bravery, patience and hope of these poor people it is difficult to know what to do to solve this most pressing problem," J. O'Donnell Derrick writes in the *Irish Weekly*: "The monarchial system will reign in Britain not through dukes or earls but through the people. Involuntary poverty is easy of solution. If the Prince persuaded those in power to decree that all natural resources must immediately be put to use, that would be the first step in solving the problem." Mr. Derrick said a great deal more and sent copies to the Prince. In reply, the following letter was received from the Prince's secretary: "I am desired by the Prince of Wales to acknowledge your letter of the 1st instant with the enclosures, which His Royal Highness was interested to receive."

U. S. SENATOR KING, of Utah, writes to Will Atkinson: "May I say that a number of years ago I read, not only Henry George's work to which you refer, but also his other published works. Henry George was a great political economist and a great political philosopher. I thank you very much for calling my attention to the abridged edition (of Protection or Free Trade) which will soon make its appearance. I shall secure a copy of the work as soon as it is available."

WE have received from the ever busy United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values (London, England) a bunch of the circulars for the general elections campaign. These were distributed by thousands at public meetings and where possible from door to door. The titles are arresting: "How to Raise Wages Without Raising Prices;" "Housing and Land Monopoly in Our Villages;" "Why Work Is Scarce and How to Mend Matters;" "The Government's De-Rating Act and How It Protects and Endows Land Monopoly," and copies of the "Land Song" were included. All of them deal with fundamental principles and are neither hesitating nor compromising. We are sure that the influence of the United Committee was felt in the campaign.

IN the *Services Sentinel and Weekly Independent*, of Malta, Ernest G. Geoghegan has a three-column article entitled, "Root Reasons," and quotes liberally from the paper drafted by Dr. McGlynn at the request of Papal Alegate Archbishop Satolli dealing with the substance of PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

WE learn that Solomon Solis Cohen, long a devoted disciple of Henry George, is out with a volume of poems, "When Love Passes By and Other Verses," which has been favorably reviewed by a number of literary periodicals.

WE were glad to welcome W. H. Renwick from Melbourne, Australia who visits this country on his way to the Edinburgh Single Tax Conference. A little reception was tendered by Anna George de Mille at which a number of local Single Taxers made their appearance to pay respects to our distinguished visitor. While here Mr. Renwick visited Boston and Washington, where he got in touch with representative of the movement in those cities.

AUGUST WILLEGES writes us under date of April 8th: "Have just returned from a month's stay in Fairhope. Had the pleasure of a few lays in Mr. and Mrs. Hennessy's company, also Albert Schalkenbach, Yancey Cohen and E. B. Gaston. I also spent a month with Harry Willock, a most charming fellow."

MR. E. W. DOTY of Cleveland, is now president of the Cleveland City Club.

WILBUR B. LUTTON, Single Taxer and a well-known Cleveland attorney, recently addressed the Cleveland Forum on "How a Just Tax Would Affect the Labor Problem."

THE Social Welfare organization of Buffalo reports that more persons are now destitute in that city than in the last thirty years.

MR. and Mrs. Charles O'Connor Hennessy made a short visit to Fairhope on their return from Florida. At a dinner tendered to our friends, Mr. Albert Schalkenbach made a felicitous speech and William Call expressed the pleasure of the company in having present the distinguished visitors. Mr. Hennessy paid a high tribute to the Fairhope management, and gave an encouraging report of the progress of the movement. Mr. E. B. Gaston read a poem by Alice Rockwell Smith which she had written for the Henry George Congress in Chicago last September.

"YOUR last number seemed to me exceptionally good," writes George T. Tideman, of Chicago. "The last number of LAND AND FREEDOM was very good," are words of praise from Hon. Edward Polak of this city. John M. Moore, of Philadelphia, writes: "I like your paper very much and consider it a splendid substitute for the *Standard* and that very excellent journal *The Public*."

THE recent conviction of Mary Ware Dennett for circulating her work on sex education furnishes additional proof of Dicken's assertion that "the law is an ass." It seems incredible that in this year of our civilization a woman like Mrs. Dennett could be convicted on a charge of this kind. It ill becomes us now to throw stones in the direction of Tennessee. For the benefit of our readers who may not know we ought to say that Mrs. Dennett is a Single Taxer and long a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM. She has been active in many good causes and her conviction is a stupid miscarriage of justice.

PRESIDENT PORTES GIL, of Mexico, has warned the large landowners that if they do not accede voluntarily to government requests and contribute their part to the fulfillment of the constitutional requirements that all villages have their communal land, the government will be obliged to see that they do so.

IN reference to the recent declaration of H. R. H. Princess Alice of Greece in favor of the Single Tax, the following card received from our good friend Poultney Bigelow will be of interest. Mr. Bigelow writes: "Since it was William II. who first made practical application of Henry George's gospel why should not a granddaughter of that far-sighted Emperor link her Hellenic name also with a great humanitarian reform? I was present when the King of Greece (then Crown Prince) married her mother in Athens in 1889."

ON April 25 M. VanVeen addressed 120 members of the Elks at Lynbrook, L. I., his subject being "Can Poverty Be Abolished?" He was well received. He analyzed the cause of poverty, which he traced to the fact that land is treated as private property. He told his hearers that what goes as rent is a deduction from the earnings of the worker

and the business man, and he fortified his contention by numerous illustrations.

AMONG recent visitors to this office was A. V. Hahn, of Los Angeles, Cal., here on a business trip. He belongs to the radical group who have not forgotten the principles learned many years ago from "Progress and Poverty."

NEW ZEALAND is in trouble with the activities of a tribe in Samoa, the Mau, who have started a policy of passive resistance against taxes and prohibition.

STATEMENT of the Ownership, Management, Circulation, etc., required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, of LAND AND FREEDOM, published Bi-Monthly at New York, N. Y., for April, 1929. State of New York, County of New York, ss.:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

JOSEPH DANA MILLER,
EDITOR.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 22nd day of March, 1929.

[Seal]

LOUIS D. SCHWARTZ, Notary Public
New York County.