

VOL. XXX, No. 2.

HOUSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
HOUSTON, TEXAS.

WHOLE No. 159

March—April, 1930

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Henry George—A Teacher of Teachers

Walter Fairchild

Open Letter to Single Taxers

Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown

The Wage Problem Solved

G. Frank Kelly

Jesus' Social Economics

W. E. Macklin

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.

MARCH—APRIL, 1930

VOL. XXX

No. 2. WHOLE No. 159

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.

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

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

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.....	35
HENRY GEORGE—A TEACHER OF TEACHERSWalter Fairchild	37
OPEN LETTER TO SINGLE TAXERS. Harry Gunnison Brown	39
THE WAGE PROBLEM SOLVED.....G. Frank Kelly	40
LECTURE WORK OF JAMES R. BROWN.....	44
DINNER OF THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB Reported by Elma Dame	46
CLEVELAND CONDITIONS BADLY MIXED.....	47
TAXATION.....James R. Brown	49
TAXATION AND PROSPERITY.....J. F. Colbert	49
THE ESSENTIAL REFORM.....P. J. Markham	51
JESUS' SOCIAL ECONOMICS.....W. E. Macklin	56
BOOK AND PAMPHLET NOTICES.....	58
CORRESPONDENCE.....	59
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	61

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. XXX

MARCH—APRIL 1930

No. 2

Comment and Reflection

SENATOR SMOOT has been thinking of how people live in our large cities. He has been thinking of the terrible congestion of people huddled in tenements. He has thought of that condition, he tells us, "a dozen times or more." As a legislator he should have thought of it more than a "dozen times." That is too infrequent a reflection. He says that he is "not able to figure out how we are going to rectify these conditions under our civilization, so-called." Yet it is a duty he owes to himself and to his constituents to figure it out.

THAT phrase "so-called" is significant that he has begun to reflect. He may have dropped it unthinkingly. Yet it is true that a civilization which permits these conditions is called civilization only by courtesy. It is something at least that Senator Smoot recognizes the anomaly. Others too have recognized it. One man observing what Senator Smoot has observed, and feeling that such conditions could not be in accord with an All-wise Providence, set himself to discover the reason. His name was Henry George, and the book in which he set forth the answer to the problem that troubles the Senator is "Progress and Poverty." We commend that book to his attention.

WHY is it we have made progress everywhere save in the distribution of wealth? Why are so many minds directed to problems of production, invention and discovery and so few to the graver problems of poverty and the making of a living? If but an infinitesimal part of the exercise of intelligent thought directed to other problems had been brought to bear on this one—how to assure to every man the opportunity to make a living—with what celerity and certainty the question had been solved!

FOR, despite the learned disputes, the flood of innumerable books, the profound theorizing over problems that need only to be stated to be understood, the thing is really very simple. The problem of making a living might be successfully taught in the lower grades of our primary schools. He would be a dull pupil indeed who, with the factors named and their relations explained,

could not portray it on the blackboard. It is a lesson for the elementary classes, simple as geography, more simple than astronomy or chemistry. Yet it seems so difficult for persons of vast learning to understand it!

LET us suppose trade reduced to the lower form of barter, where a man brings a pair of shoes to the grocer for a barrel of potatoes, or the farmer drives to the country store his garden truck for so many pounds of sugar. Now the landlord has nothing that he can place in his wagon or in his car to be exchanged for shoes or farm products. Not a thing has he fashioned with his hands that he can offer the shoemaker or farmer. He has no exchangeable commodities—as a landlord he does not work; he creates no wealth; he is poor and helpless indeed, dependent on the sufferance of those who work. Explained in terms of barter the problem becomes crystal clear.

HE has something, of course. That is a bit of legal paper conferring a taxing power on the maker of shoes and the grower of farm products. This power is almost unlimited, or limited only by the value of land created by others on which farmer and shoemaker must work. So he takes so many shoes or so many bushels of potatoes. This in terms of barter, if barter it can be called. Something the landlord has. That is a power granting *permission to work*. For this permission labor and capital make terms with him. The landlord of course is master of the situation. So bartering nothing he has created, for the landlord per se creates nothing and has nothing but this bit of paper to compel the acceptance of his terms, he determines the conditions on which men must work. The invention and use of money do not change the transaction. The shoes and potatoes take the form of dollars, but they are still shoes and potatoes. Nor in our complex system of production and exchange are the essentials of the transaction altered. It is still barter between a number of individuals now greatly multiplied, and a more extended cooperation among producers, with this silent partner in production, who continues to contribute nothing and takes all he can—the Owner of the Land.

AND the overcrowding evil which Senator Smoot is worried about. It is another phase of the same disease caused by the unrestricted power of landlordism. Does

he doubt it? Then let him reflect upon the statement of Lord Loreburn (Lord Chancellor) who says:

"Overcrowding is simply caused because land values are so high that the rents become necessarily high, though the land is not fully made use of for commercial purposes, and the people cannot afford to pay these rents. They are thus driven into these hovels and wretched slums from which so many evil consequences arise. On one side you have the population swept up from the country to London: on the other side, you have these great land values confronting them there and driving them into the slums. There is no question whatever that this is one of the chief causes of this overcrowding evil."

EVERYBODY has a suggestion to make on how to solve the unemployment problem. The ministers of churches throughout the country are especially vocal in proposing remedies for the existing distress. Most of these suggestions are fantastic enough. The Rev. Herbert D. Hudnut, pastor of the Windermere Presbyterian Church in East Cleveland, Ohio, proposes the following: "If 2,000 shops, stores and factories would re-employ five men or women tomorrow morning and pay each \$5. a day for three months the unemployment situation would be relieved and we would be attempting to solve a serious problem in the light of Christ's teachings."

THE owners of shops, stores and factories are not responsible for the present situation. They do not lay off men and women in their employ because they want to, but because they have to. They are not the real employers of labor—those who can make an effective demand for the goods offered for sale are the real employers. What the Rev. Doctor is proposing is charity—he is asking 2,000 employers of labor to give up something, to employ labor unprofitable to them, to sacrifice \$25. a day. It does not seem to occur to him that few of these proprietors of shops stores and factories could do this; it would reduce the larger number of them to bankruptcy. And would it solve the question of unemployment? It would not. For at the end of three months the same condition would be restored, intensified now by a further amount of goods for which there is no effective demand. The Reverend pastor means well but he will have to try again.

SOLVING the question in the light of Christ's teaching!" We do not believe Christ would go about in that way. Confronted by the problem he would first ask if there was not some deep underlying injustice that should be done away with. Surely his appeal would have been first to justice rather than to charity. And he would have seen that it was not a question of justice between employer and employee, between capital and labor, but a question of fundamental justice in the organization of society. Unemployment is but a symptom of its denial.

CLEVELAND has another pastor who is righteously indignant at conditions. Rev. John Taylor Alton, D.D., pastor of the Windermere Methodist Church in East Cleveland, has this to say:

"No industry should be allowed to operate in such a manner that it can ruthlessly and without warning dump an army of unemployed out on the street. If there is a slack in sales let the work that remains be divided among the workmen."

BUT Dr. Alton makes the same mistake as his Presbyterian brother. He, too, regards the question as one between employer and hired man. Consequently he gets no further than his fellow pastor. Both seem to have little concern as to what becomes of the owners of shops, stores and factories. Indeed if they cannot find employment for everybody, out with them! "They must not drop their workmen out in the street," cries the pastor. These employers are to divide up the work with the employees when times are slack. Communism goes not much further than this. And of course government must compel them to do it. Government must see that it is done—always government, more and more of it. And yet these ministers are kindly and well-disposed. Perhaps all they need is a friendly guide to point the way, and just a little knowledge.

THE *San Francisco Chronicle* is a great newspaper. We say this advisedly. It must be a great newspaper to get off anything like this. It says: "The shade of Henry George must chuckle as he looks at the scheme adopted by the city of Pittsburgh." Then says the *Chronicle*: "Single Tax or 50 per cent. of it, to be exact. And the thing is all there. * * * * He was going to abolish idle land by making it pay all the taxes." Now is not that a wonderful statement of what George proposed? Where do you suppose the writer found it? Out of his head, of course, and not in George. And of course the Pittsburgh half rate tax on improvements is not even 50 per cent. of the Single Tax. We wish it were.

THEN the writer proceeds to make it worse. "A fine theory, no doubt if it had been inaugurated in the days of Adam and Eve, but hardly practicable at the late day when Henry George arrived on earth." Now can you beat that? Is there any hope for journalism in California, or is there any hope for a man intelligent enough to write at all who can write anything like that? He has admitted that 50 per cent. of the theory is in operation in Pittsburgh; he is in error even in that statement. Indeed it is impossible for him to state anything in accordance with the facts.

WE have heard it before—*viz*, that Henry George's theory would have been all right if it had been started at the beginning of the world. It seems not to have occurred

to these sapient objectors that economic rent is annually recurring, and that we propose to take it for governmental uses. What has been collected by private individuals in all the previous years has been spent by the gentlemen who collected it. It is gone and we cannot get it back. But the annual rent of every piece of land can be collected this fiscal year, and continued each year as rent arises.

THINK what the *Chronicle* would have said if it had been on hand when it was proposed to abolish chaos and substitute cosmos. It would have argued that the world had got along pretty well with the previous condition of chaos. The thing had lasted so long that it must be all right. Then who were these cosmos fellows anyhow? People without standing in the community who were interfering with established order, or disorder, which after all was the only order with which they were familiar.

ASSUMING the fancy not an impossible one, the community would now divide into supporters of chaos and defenders of the new theory of cosmos. The *Chronicle* would immediately throw its influence with the former group. It would argue that if the new theory had been tried at the beginning it might have been all right, but it was too late in the day to attempt the overthrow of the old order. Had not chaos been ordained from the beginning? Had it not the sanction of law and religion? And who had any experience with cosmos anyway? These reformers were interfering with the vested interests of chaos. So the argument would have run as it runs even unto the present day!

Henry George— A Teacher of Teachers

HIS PLACE IN THE EDUCATIONAL WORLD

SOMWHERE in his biography, Henry George, Jr. says of his father, that the only title that Henry George ever really desired was that of Professor. It is related that Henry George, having attained considerable fame for his writing and speaking, was invited to address the class in economics at the University of California, with the idea that he would be asked to fill the chair in economics. After the lecture, which was attended by members of the faculty, and some of the trustees, in addition to the students, there was a silence with respect to the expected call to the professorship, which was due not to the quality of the man, nor to his standard of learning, but rather to the then considered radical character of the subject matter he had presented. The call never came, and Henry George never received the title of professor.

Like Moses, Henry George was permitted to go up unto the heights and look over into the academic promised land, but he was not permitted to enter.

This was before "Progress and Poverty" was written.

It is possible, and indeed probable that if Henry George had been granted a professorship at the time his heart desired it, the book "Progress and Poverty," as we now have it, would never have been written.

"Progress and Poverty" was written not for the Professors, but for humanity. Later in life after his fame was established for all time, Henry George wrote a treatise for the professors in his volumes entitled THE SCIENCE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. These later books are learned in method and sound in doctrine, but they lack something of the fire of life which makes "Progress and Poverty" move and breathe as a living thing, inspired and inspiring, placing it among the two or three of the world's great books of all time.

If Henry George had written only his volumes on Political Economy, he would have earned a high rank among the professors. But his "Progress and Poverty," which the professors in early days were inclined to decry, has placed Henry George in the front rank of humanity's great men.

As was told to the writer, only a few days ago by the professor of economics in one of the leading schools in the South, Henry George has placed himself for all time, and his works will continue to be read and studied by mankind a thousand years from today.

It is a remarkable thing that the teachers of economics in the colleges and universities today do not use for their class instruction and reference reading, the Political Economy volumes which Henry George prepared especially for that purpose, but always and invariably use the text from "Progress and Poverty."

It is safe to say that no student of economics attains his Master's or Doctor's degree without a first hand knowledge of the text of "Progress and Poverty." The use of this book among advanced students in the universities has increased rather than decreased with the passage of the years. Today, it stands as standard in its particular field. Every economic department in every school in the country takes up that subject at some point in its course, and considers by name and by text the proposition contained in "PROGRESS AND POVERTY."

Henry George was denied the title of Professor, which he coveted, but he has become a super-professor in that he is by his book, a teacher of teachers. Not since Adam Smith has there appeared any man or any book that has so profoundly affected the thought and teaching method of the professor of economics. Indeed, the works of Adam Smith and of his followers, John Stuart Mill and others, may pass from academic vogue, but "Progress and Poverty" will remain.

Under the sponsorship of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, it has been the writer's privilege to visit a large number of schools, colleges and universities in the Eastern, Middle West and Southern States. The purpose of these trips has been to interview the heads of the economic departments and the instructors, and encourage

or facilitate the use of "Progress and Poverty" as a text book or as collateral reading.

In the course of these trips, one taken in the spring of 1929, and two this season, I have personally visited more than 75 institutions of learning, including Princeton, Pennsylvania, Cornell, Washington, Pittsburgh, Carnegie Tech, Cincinnati, Ohio State, Berea, Missouri, Wisconsin, Northwestern, Chicago, Oberlin, Western Reserve, Harvard, William and Mary, Johns Hopkins, Virginia, Washington and Lee, Richmond, Duke, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Emory, Georgia Institute of Technology, Florida, Stetson, Rollins, Chattanooga, and many smaller colleges, normal schools and teacher's colleges.

I have personally interviewed nearly 200 professors and teachers of economics, and I do not make a single exception in saying that the attitude of them all is friendly, intelligent and cooperative.

It is a tradition among Single Taxers of the old school that the professorial mind is antagonistic to the teachings of Henry George. To such I would bear the message that the academic times have changed, and that the new generation of teachers, many of whom have been born and have grown to manhood since Henry George passed away, know their "Progress and Poverty."

In classes in elementary economics, such as are commonly represented in the Sophomore and Junior years in college, the amount of time that is possible to be devoted to the subject of economic ground rent, is limited to two or three hours as a rule. Most teachers find it impracticable in that short period, to use the unabridged "Progress and Poverty" as a text or to require the students to read it in its entirety.

To meet this condition, Professor Harry Gunnison Brown, of Missouri University, made selections from "Progress and Poverty" for use in his classes. These selections have been printed in the volume of 90 pages entitled "Significant Paragraphs from 'Progress and Poverty.'" As a preface to this book, appears the impressive essay on Henry George by Professor John Dewey of Columbia. This volume, published by the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation of New York, has been most acceptable to the academic departments. Many thousand copies have been sold and distributed to schools throughout the United States and in Canada. It has been a valuable addition to the working tools of the Single Tax cause.

Information about the book and the extent of its use may be found elsewhere in these columns.

Everywhere there is evidence of a revival of interest in Single Tax theory and there is ground for the hope that this generation may see the truth of the Single Tax established, not only in the academic world, but also in practical application in our government affairs.

WALTER FAIRCHILD.

SEND in any names of likely subscribers to LAND AND FREEDOM. We will forward sample copies.

Prosperity

1. "All I know is what I read in the papers."—WILL ROGERS.

2. For week ending Nov. 2nd, 1929, car loadings were 62,160 less than the preceding week and 32,292 less than the same week of 1928.—*San Francisco Examiner*, 11-14,-1929.

3. N. Y. Stock Exchange announced Nov. 20th total decline in value of all listed shares during October was \$15,320,979,515.—*Christian Science Monitor*, 11-21-1929.

4. Klamath Basin timber production payroll "this year will not exceed \$8,000,000 as compared with \$12,000,000 for last year."—*Sacramento Bee*, 11-29-1929.

5. San Francisco building permits numbered 560 with an aggregate value of \$2,487,796.00. Last November the permits numbered 588 with a total value of \$4,220,382.00.—*San Francisco News*, 12-2-1929.

6. A California man shot himself in Milwaukee leaving an estate of 4 cents. His will gave his body to science, his soul to Andrew W. Mellon and his sympathy to his creditors, but made no provision for his estate.

7. Figures of 587 leading cities and towns of the United States, show building permits issued indicating a loss of 29% over Nov. 1928, and a loss of 23% compared with Oct. 1929, the preceding month.—*San Francisco News*, 12-13-1929.

8. Mrs. Andrew Day, Three Rivers, P. Q., Canada and seven children, 1 to 14 years old, found dead with throats cut. Mr. Day found wandering streets with throat cut. He was a \$10 a day employee of local paper and pulp company. Lost his money in stock market.—*Sacramento Bee*, 12-16-1929.

9. U. S. Treasury asks bids on short term Treasury bills of about \$100,000,000. Total applied for was \$223,901,000. Government only had to pay 3-3/4% for the money.—*San Francisco Chronicle*, 12-17-29.

10. It is announced that doles to unemployed in Great Britain next year will amount to \$610,000,000.—*Sacramento Bee*, 12-20-1929.

11. Reduction of 43,905 cars in shipments of the nation's 29 principal commodities during the first quarter of 1930 was forecast to day by the American Railway Association.—*The Examiner*, San Francisco, 1-3-1930.

12. Sixth Bank Closes Doors in Alabama.—*San Francisco Examiner*, 1-12-1930.

13. Shrinkage reported for December steel production to lowest of any month since 1924.—*San Francisco Chronicle*, 1-13-1930.

14. Investigation of the Federal Trade Commission has revealed that 13% of the people of the United States own 90% of all our wealth, and that 87% of our people own the small change.—W. A. GRAUNKE of University of Wisconsin, in *The Progressive* (LaFollette's weekly) Madison, Wis., 1-18-1930.

15. General creditors lost about \$30,000,000 MORE

through bankruptcies last year than in the preceding year, and got back LESS on each dollar of their claims, according to an analysis of the Attorney General's report by the *Credit Monthly Magazine*.—*San Francisco News*, 1-21-1930.

16. American Railway Association announced for week ending Jan. 18, a decrease of 15,838 cars from the previous week, decrease of 84,508 from same week of 1929, and decrease of 37,330 cars from same week of 1928.—*San Francisco News*, 1-29-1930.

17. A decrease of \$5,000,000 in net profits during 1929 as compared with 1928, was shown in the annual stockholders' report of Montgomery Ward & Co., today.—*San Francisco News*, 1-27-1930.

18. Vancouver unemployed parade charged by mounted officers.—*San Francisco Chronicle*, 1-28-1930.

19. Chicago, Jan. 29. A score of persons injured here today when 10,000 men and women battled madly in a department store for 2,000 jobs.—*San Francisco Call-Bulletin*, 1-29-1930.

20. *Bank clearings* this week at all leading cities in the United States, as reported to Dun's Review, are 23.6% smaller than those of a year ago.—*San Francisco Examiner*, 2-2-1930.

21. There are nearly 40,000 "millionaires" in the United States today, according to statistics of income for 1928 issued by the Treasury Department. In 1927 taxes on INCOMES OF ONE MILLION OR MORE were paid by 290 persons, in 1928 by 496 persons.—*San Francisco News*, 2-3-1930.

N.B. Now, read No. 14 again.

22. Sixth Bank closes in North Carolina.—*San Francisco Examiner*, 2-6-1930.

23. Facing another year with the 1929 crop practically unmarketed and the 1928 crop still showing a hang-over in storage, hundreds of millions of dollars are at stake for the Canadian farmer in the battle for wheat sales on the world market.—*San Francisco Chronicle*, 2-8-1930.

GEORGE CARTWRIGHT.

A Remedy

THE author of "Progress and Poverty," however, is not content with mere analysis. He has envisaged a wrong, and offers a remedy consistent with the principles of a sound and unified political economy. He shows that land monopoly is the beginning of all poverty, and in the first chapter of Book V., in which he deals with the phenomenon of industrial depression, a flood of light is thrown upon the unemployment problem.

A fine tribute was paid to the author of "Progress and Poverty" by the late H. W. Massingham, who said that Henry George, in revealing that a land problem cries out for solution in town as well as in country, performed a signal service to humanity.

Labor Herald, London, Eng.

An Open Letter to Single Taxers

SINGLE TAXERS are dreaming and talking of an ideal economic system—dreaming of a kind of "celestial city"—while the enemy is carrying off the spoils of war. What Single Taxers are talking about is too remote from the day-to-day struggles of political life to mean much to the masses. We need to make our propaganda relate to current controversies. We can't stir the average man by a discussion of far-off and (to him) seemingly unrealizable and abstract ideals. We may be able to stir him—and stir him to really fight—if we plunge into some current controversy that appears to him "practical" and important, stress the relation to it of the principles that we believe to be fundamental, and so spread a knowledge of those principles through the general interest in the controversies to which they apply.

We should draw a lesson, too—but I fear most Single Taxers won't—from the history of the struggle over slavery. Certainly honor is due to those idealists who asserted, in season and out, that slavery was wrong and ought to be abolished. But general popular sentiment was probably influenced much more rapidly through the problem's entering practical politics in a fight over the further extension of slavery. After a generation of controversy over that question and not over the question of abolition, popular sentiment became greatly aroused, the evils of slavery were more and more heatedly discussed and the time was ripe for the organization of a great political party pledged, as a party, against (still only this) any further extension of slave territory. The end of the whole matter was abolition but the means of arousing the masses and making them sense the great underlying human issue involved was the insistence on a more moderate policy that seemed to them immediately practicable and thus interested them.

Into what controversies can we enter? Into all political struggles in which one side calls for relieving "real estate" and, therefore, land, of taxes and putting the burden anywhere else. At every turn we can point out what calamitous results must tend to follow:—congestion, high rents, high salable value of land, tenancy (or acquisition of land ownership only through heavy mortgage indebtedness followed, often, by bankruptcy and foreclosure), and the using of funds secured from taxes other than on land in such a way as to add to the value of the land of some owners and thus gain them a special privilege income at the expense of the public. If we cannot, as yet, interest the masses in the "Single Tax" as such, we may at least be able to interest them in the evil results of taking taxes off of land and putting the burden elsewhere. As understanding spreads we may often hold a balance of power and be able to say: "No, you shall not take taxes off of land and, if you want us to help take them off of improvements, you can get sup-

port from us only by conceding *some* increase in the tax on land values."

But now, while Single Taxers are living in a fools paradise of hope, the forces of reaction are putting a larger and larger proportion of the burden elsewhere than on land. *Many states have already abolished absolutely the tax on property so far as purely state revenue is concerned*, and state funds secured from other sources are being shared with local communities *so that real estate may be "relieved."* The first great battle *may* come when we demand that this *removal of taxes from land absolutely cease*. It is *high time* for this demand. If we make it, and give our reasons effectively, we shall be preparing the minds of men for the next step. But we *must stop this swing backward* or our case will be well-nigh hopeless.

Many men who have no real understanding of Single Tax, and who think themselves opposed to it, are nevertheless opposed also to the new taxes being substituted for taxes on real estate. *They are anxious to find weapons for the fight and will often use some of our arguments, if we put these arguments into their thinking, without necessarily seeing to what these arguments may ultimately lead. Thus we greatly multiply our effective army. Sometimes our allies will be the people in a specific line or lines of business,—like the druggists when soft drinks taxes are proposed, or the moving picture people when it is proposed to tax the movies. Sometimes they will be city professional and business interests who fear that increasing state income taxes to relieve land will unduly burden them. Whoever they are, it is for us to welcome, aid and use them, while also continuing our own positive propaganda, until, by these processes of education, we have spread an understanding and appreciation of the land problem far beyond our little group of idealists. Then will the time be ripe for some inspiring leader to focus in a challenging demand for reform the growing sentiment, and win a victory which may appear dramatic and sudden but to which all those will have contributed who, in a more disheartening period, constantly fought the propaganda of "tax relief for real estate."*

HARRY GUNNISON BROWN.

THE taxation of the site value, if it could replace the whole of the rates on building, would entirely sweep away this obstacle to the builder's enterprise. So far as it is used to diminish the rates on building it diminishes the obstacle. For many years we have maintained that the greatest and simplest reform in housing would be simply to lower if not to sweep away the tax on building.

Manchester Guardian.

IT is unendurable, that great increments, great additions, that have not been earned by those to whom they accrue, and have been formed by the industry of others, should be absorbed by people who have not contributed to that increase.—JOHN MORLEY.

The Wage Problem Solved

UNDER our present system no man can determine what is an honest wage. In labor disputes invariably the employee feels that he should have more (in which he is always right) while the employer as invariably feels (and generally rightly) that he cannot afford to pay more. To pay more would, as a rule, mean bankruptcy. Though both are right in their feeling, neither labor nor capital gets what is its due and yet neither knows why.

It is all a matter of feeling, of sentiment, of negotiation and compromise—get as much and pay as little as you can. Well disposed though both sides may be, they know no way out of the dilemma. Hence the ceaseless strife between even the best disposed employers and employees.

Can we arrive at the equities of their seemingly unsolvable wage problem?

It is axiomatic that a man earns and owns what he produces and should receive and possess that production, or its equivalent, as his own. What each man produces is his true (economic) wage. There should be and is a way to determine that product. Robinson Crusoe received his true wage—there was no one to interfere. Friday when Crusoe came was not allowed to work for himself, nor even to work for and receive his full wage. On the other hand a relationship was established by which Friday received a mere subsistence and Crusoe appropriated the remainder of his wage. There was no attempt to determine Friday's true wage which was so merged into that of Crusoe's that such a determination probably could not have been made.

Suppose one hundred families were to arrive on a previously uninhabited island, a la Crusoe; each family sets up for itself with perfect freedom to occupy a site for that purpose without purchase. Each family gets the result of its own effort—its wage. Results to individuals will vary with industry and efficiency. Later arrivals will choose adjacent sites and do likewise till the capacity of the island is exhausted. If one with executive capacity, (an entrepreneur) so organizes and directs a group that increased production results, all that remains after the others have received their true wage, will accrue to the executive and be his wage, though it be many fold the wage of the ordinary worker. He has done just what each of the others has done—created what otherwise would not have been. He makes no profit at the expense of the others, each of whom gets all he earns. If the total earnings under the direction of the executive do not exceed those of the members of the group working separately, then the executive earns nothing and should receive nothing. It is assumed of course that capital receives its economic share in the distribution of earnings. Here then is a natural and equitable distribution of wealth.

What if ten men in the above group were to say to the others and enforce it, "You are slaves," or (which is the

equivalent), "You are free but you may not use the land, may not have a site on which to locate, may not even take the timber from the woods, or have to build a boat to get away from the island until you shall have bought land from us or paid us rent"—tribute. Economically, what difference would it make whether those people were slaves or free, whether they or the land necessary to their existence was "owned" by someone else? In either event those who held the land would command the services of the others at any compensation the former chose to pay—merely enough to maintain their existence and that only so long as the services of the latter were needed. Without free access to land, men are helpless—are economic slaves so long as their services are needed. This power comes from the fact that one collects ground rent from another—that one must purchase or pay rent to another before he may use land.

The history of the island of Britain (of all civilized peoples) is an exact parallel to the condition set forth in the last preceding paragraph as to our seemingly imaginary island, though it seems incredible that any set of men would have the temerity to attempt such inequity (iniquity) or that other men would submit.

When the Normans conquered Britain, it was established that all the land "belonged" to the crown, the crown allotted it to his barons and the common people became serfs and, in this enlightened twentieth century, nearly all the people of Britain exist on the land at the pleasure of the landlords and pay tribute to them. The inequalities are worse today than at the beginning and still growing worse. In early Britain the serfs had certain rights in the land which landlords were bound to respect. Though the masses are no longer called serfs, they are deprived of practically all ancient rights in the land enjoyed by the serfs with no compensating rights in return except to vote and call themselves "freemen."

We inherited Britain's land system. The crown owned America as it owned Britain, and awarded its lands to favorites, or creditors, or to those who would pay most for it. And so, for example, in Pennsylvania, for nearly two hundred and fifty years, if a man has been desirous of using the most remote vacant land, he may not do so legally unless he first buy or lease it from the Penns or their successors in title.

Lord Fairfax was granted 5,000,000 acres in Virginia, Washington had more than 50,000 acres there (probably not used to 5% of its capacity) and the state was practically divided into great estates. Thus arose the "poor whites" and negro slavery. From the same cause arose also the "restless pioneer" who, unwilling to submit to slavery, chattel or economic, went to Kentucky or the Northwest, hoping there to establish estates similar to those of Virginia and Britain.

Had land been available in Virginia there would have been no restless pioneers. Men would have taken land adjacent to their neighbors and kinfolk and Kentucky and the

Northwest and later the Great West would have been settled only when the natural growth in population should have overflowed into those territories. Developments of the new areas would have been postponed, but to the great economic advantage of both the old and the new—the growth of both would have been normal and life in each more desirable and comfortable.

With the Normans masters of Britain, however justly or unjustly, by what rule of right or equity did William allot the land to certain "nobles" and establish serfdom for the rank and file, including the soldiers who fought and won his battles. It was the same as if, following our late war, General Foch, General Pershing and other commanders and their heirs forever had been granted great estates in the conquered countries and the private soldiers and their children after them forcibly attached to those estates and compelled to labor on terms prescribed by law or by the landlord. Every British and American land title originally resulted from conquest, and these titles have not improved morally though transmitted by entail, inheritance or sale for centuries.

Such is the genesis of the land titles of Britain and America. Had every man had free access to land as was his right, there could have been no serfdom or slavery. As serfdom declined or was abolished, the "freemen," still without rights to land, were compelled to seek employment and employers. Thus arose what economists call "free labor" in contrast with serfdom—free to work where they pleased if employment was to be found, otherwise to starve, or become objects of charity. And now the same conditions exist in Britain and America as existed in our imaginary island when a few usurped ownership. It is readily seen that these "free laborers," without free access to land, are competitors with each other in the labor market. It is also apparent that, not what they earn (produce), but what they can demand will be their pay. When "times are good" and employers plentiful, labor may to some extent dictate. When there are few employers and many looking for work, the laborer, if he is so fortunate as to secure a job, must accept any pay offered even to the margin of existence, or less, for many succumb and die, and women and children go hungry under the strain and privation to which they are subjected.

That the pay envelope bears no relation to the earnings of the payee is readily seen in recent experiences. During and following the war, notwithstanding the payment of unprecedented wages, the profits of many an employer (not because he earned them but because of the accident of his position) were greater than his entire pay roll. Until recently when "big business" was in receipt of unprecedented profits, wages were declining, as a result of competition for jobs between men thrown out of work by the installation of machinery, mergers and other causes.

Though the United States has a billion acres of arable

idle land and its used land is used to but a small fractional part of its capacity, those men cannot have access to it even for subsistence, because it is "owned" and held out of use by speculators, who hold by such titles as indicated above. Arthur Brisbane recently said the whole population of the world could subsist comfortably in Texas. The land was made for the race of all ages and no man has a right to any part of it except to use it. To as much as he can use he has an inalienable right. Sir William Blackstone in his "Commentaries," which has been the principal text book in America and Britain for a hundred and fifty years, of all law students, says: "Accurately and strictly speaking, there is no foundation in nature or natural laws why a set of words on parchment should convey the dominion of land." It is a sound principle that no man can give a better title to land than he has received. If the crown had no moral right to convey land as it has done, then no subsequent conveyance, no number of conveyances, can correct the original wrong, and every such attempt at conveyance is morally invalid.

Under the present system men are helpless because forced from the land. How may it be established that every worker shall receive his economic wage—his exact produce? Is it not apparent that it can be done by restoring to man his natural right of free access to land by appropriating ground rent to public use? With this alternative men will be in position to dictate the terms on which they will leave the land and accept work elsewhere. Their demand will be their natural or economic wage—all they earn.

Suppose one hundred men with their families were to arrive in a country previously uninhabited and settle there on equal footing. Humans cannot live except on land, which naturally and morally belongs equally to all. This is a requisite to equality. So each family without pay or hindrance settles down on a piece of land. The sites probably are distributed by lot as when the invading Israelites entered the Promised Land. For the time being, assume all the sites to be equally desirable and productive. Every family has a place of abode, a sure means of livelihood (self-employment on the land) and every man receives all he produces—his economic wage. Results to individuals on the various sites will vary with industry and efficiency.

Now a factory settles there and wants men. It is evident that what the individuals can earn on the land, together with the comparative desirability of the work, will determine the wages that the industry must pay to secure employees—the minimum wage. Moreover every man will be perfectly free to accept or reject the work offered; employer and employee will be on equal footing. Such terms as master and servant will be unknown.

The wage will be limited only by the capacity (producing capacity) of the individual. As all will be employed to their full capacity or desire, power of purchase and consumption will be multiplied, production will keep pace,

there will be no business cycles, prosperity will be ceaseless and competition for workers will result always in maximum wages—to each worker his actual production.

The land on Broadway with its sky-scrapers and army of workers is as essential to production as the suburban truck farm and the respective contributions to production of the different areas are in exact proportion to their respective market values—rent or selling value is determined by productivity.

The physiocrats made the mistake of thinking that agricultural land is the sole ultimate source of all production (wealth) and so proposed that land should pay all public revenue—taxation at the source. Henry George saw that all used land has a part in and is essential to production and proposed that all such land shall contribute to public requirements, each area in proportion to its part in production as measured by its rent value. Thus would public revenue be obtained at the actual source of production. He saw that ultimately every worker works on the land, doing his bit in supplying the animal, vegetable and mineral products essential to the race.

What is a man's wages? How can we measure his produce?

Some years ago one of our largest coal producing concerns had a general master mechanic in charge of all the machinery of its more than fifty plants. In the midst of a "boom" when prices and profits were unprecedented and the closing of a plant meant the loss of several thousand dollars per day, an accident occurred. A telephone conversation followed between the General Superintendent and the G. M. M.:

G. S.—(very earnestly) The crank shaft at Blank plant broke just as today's run was completed, how soon can you get in a new one, how much time must we lose?

G. M. M.—Don't let that worry you; we'll fix it tonight and you can make your usual run in the morning.

G. S.—You don't understand. The crank shaft is broken.

G. M. M.—Yes, I understand. I looked at that a year ago and saw it was going to break. I had a new one made, it is lying in the shop. We will put it in tonight and you can make your usual run tomorrow.

That master mechanic held his job on account of his efficiency. We will not attempt to determine his share in production (his economic wage) what portion of the thousands of dollars he no doubt was constantly saving his employer, should be his. Suffice to say that with business always at capacity (what we are accustomed to in "boom" times) every man will be in demand and free competition between employers for men's services will result in each man being paid his economic wage. With the alternative of free access to land the economic wage will be automatically determined—our master mechanic and every other man (all being freemen) will demand and get what they produce or its equivalent. Each individual will de-

termine his own wage—he will get what he demands or find self-employment, always available. Each will actually get what his fellows will pay for his product.

While there will be a constant "boom" it will be merely a normal condition, every phase and factor of production will be adapted to it and it will be without the feverish nervousness and excitement that accompanies our temporary periods of super prosperity.

Moreover, men will desire other things than material gain and much time will be spent in recreational and cultural pursuits. It will require an astonishingly short time daily (with modern machinery it has been estimated at as low as thirty minutes) to gain a comfortable livelihood since every man will receive all he produces, and additional income will depend on the effort the individual may be willing to devote to the acquisition of more wealth, which will have no value except to satisfy his individual desires—it will give him neither position nor power. Probably most men will spend as much time with their avocations as their vocations. Men will engage in occupations to their liking and adaptation, no square pegs in round holes, work will be play, a joy to the worker. As men will receive only what they earn, no one can cheat—every wage will be an honest wage.

Not only the farmer, but every man who performs a service, works on the land and is a producer. The grain from the farm or the mineral from the mine is not "produced" till it is in the hands of the consumer. To place it there requires the plowman and the miner, the railroad official and the track hand, the truck driver, the merchant, the salesman, all the executives and clerks that handle the business, all the army of skilled and unskilled workmen who produce all the machinery, equipment, factories, homes and every requirement of production. The railroad official and his stenographer and the laborer on the railroad are as truly producers of wheat and coal as is the man who reaps the grain or with pick and shovel loads the coal in the mine. Probably there are no greater factors in production than the physician who keeps us fit physically and the man of God who ministers to our spiritual needs. And there are the writer, the orator, the poet, the artist, the musician and every man who aids in maintaining morale and adds to human knowledge and happiness, or inspires men to nobler deeds and better lives. Every one of these is a producer, supplementing the work of the man in the furrow. The basis of production is land, the means is labor. All workers work on the land—there is no other place where men can work.

The workers may be thought of as an inverted pyramid with the man in the furrow at the apex, the area ever increasing to the top, and all resting on the land. The structure contains every individual contributing to the welfare of mankind.

While a man's earning, self-employed on the land, determines the wage, the wage of the immediate worker on the soil will not be greatly different from that accruing from

equal ability and effort applied elsewhere. Since land is the basis of all labor, it is evident, if proper economic conditions were established, equal effort and equal efficiency would automatically produce equal returns wherever applied or employed. A perfect balance will be maintained, a perfect fluidity of labor, because all men will be free to come and go as they please. If there should be a tendency for work at one point to command more wages than at another, men would flock to that place and thus automatically reduce wages there and raise them at the deserted places. The law of supply and demand would have free play and determine wages on a normal basis. Each family will have such income that every child will be "well born."

While free access to land is the one requisite to the establishment of equity, it will not be sufficient to allot certain land to each individual or family and then say to each, "Now make the best of what you have." The reason is that different sites have different values. One must have an advantage over another on account of location. That is a fundamental defect in our present system. Some have sites that have little or no site value while other sites of very limited area pay (produce) thousands per annum, with no more effort by the producer than is expended on the poorer site. Establish equity by taking all ground rent for public use and thus equalizing advantages of location.

To a lone resident like Crusoe, there is but one factor in production, namely labor. The product has no value except for use by the producer. In a community the product has a commercial or sale value. The latter depends on location, whence arises site value. The better the site (the more fertile it is or the more social advantages it enjoys) the greater the value of the product. This is not due to the labor of the producer but to environment, the presence and activities of the community.

The measure of site value is ground rent—witness the enormous ground rents at the centers of urban population where the produce is not vegetables but dollars. Labor of individuals produces the labor values, community efforts the site values, and each should have what it produces. At present the "owner" gets the value produced by site advantage—rent. It is proposed that the public, its creator and rightful owner, shall take this product.

As there would be no one but the occupant wanting the poorest occupied sites, they would command no rent—the "owners" would occupy them without cost. Each site above the poorest would pay to the public treasury the difference between its annual produce and the annual produce of the poorest occupied site with the same expenditure of labor and capital.

Thus all would be on an equal basis—the occupant of the best urban site would have no advantage over the most remote cultivator of the soil. One might have a "Lizzie" and the other a Rolls-Royce, but whatever either had would be purchased from his wages (the results of

his own labor) and not from his being in position to take the efforts of others by appropriating ground rent.

The value of site advantage is a natural fund created for public use. It increases as the community and its requirements increase and is always adequate to public requirements.

As the income from ground rent would be adequate for public needs, all taxes would be automatically abolished. The amount of ground rent would be graduated from large payments for lots at the urban centers to nothing for lands at the perimeter of population.

The ground rent of rural lands would be low and, as there would be no taxes on improvements, or personal property, the contributions of the farmer and other ruralites to the public revenue would gradually decline with distance from the center and reach zero at the perimeter. The contribution to public revenue by the farmers would be greatly reduced. The bulk of the public revenue would come from urban lots and royalties or rentals from natural resources. Every site would pay in proportion to its social advantages—pay for what it got in return and all royalties would go to the public treasury.

Men would settle contiguously on advantageous locations, and beyond the perimeter of population no man would have or want land titles. Land there would be free as air and just as nature left it. Here would be inexhaustible publicly owned timber resources and a limitless paradise for sportsmen and pleasure seekers. Every power site and every natural wonder and resource would be public property. With her present population, the United States would have a domain of a billion acres of such land—the billion acres now held idle for speculation by private “owners” and being denuded of everything valuable for their private gain.

Thus in a simple way (by taking ground rent for public use) we solve the labor problem and with it the many other seemingly complex social and economic problems.

G. FRANK KELLY.

Henry George in the Congressional Record

MR. WHEELER (Senator Wheeler, of Montana) “Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the *Record* certain excerpts from Henry George’s *Protection or Free Trade*.”

The Vice President: “Without objection, it is so ordered.”

Thus, there is printed in the *Congressional Record* of March 13 the “Outline of Protection or Free Trade” in full as made by Will Atkinson.

The tariff just passed is bound to create a revulsion of feeling, and the sentiment for free trade will grow with increasing unemployment.

Lecture Work of James R. Brown

JAMES R. BROWN has rendered a report of his lecture work for the last fifteen years beginning with Jan. 1st, 1915, when he assumed the presidency of the Manhattan Single Tax Club.

During these years he has delivered 1,865 lectures distributed among the states as follows:

New York, 769; Massachusetts, 157; Virginia, 145; Canada, 145; New Jersey, 140; Pennsylvania, 139; Ohio, 101; Maryland, 88; Rhode Island, 88; Connecticut, 32; Indiana, 18; Michigan, 15; Illinois, 11; Dis. of Columbia, 8; New Hampshire, 5; Delaware, 2; Maine, 1; Wisconsin, 1.

Last year, 1929, Mr. Brown delivered 209 lectures distributed as follows:

Business organizations, 84; universities, colleges and schools, 90; churches, 7; sundry organizations, 28. Attendance at these lectures have run from 25 to 2,000.

Besides the lecture activities articles on taxation and the Single Tax are sent every month to 850 newspapers. Many papers have used this matter; and many have made it the basis of editorials treating of taxation and their own local problems.

A constant stream of literature in the shape of books and pamphlets goes forward from headquarters, and great care is exercised in the distribution of this material. This work is under the supervision of Miss Beatrice Cohen, the able and efficient assistant secretary of the organization, who in the absence of Mr. Brown on his lecture tours directs the machinery of the club, answers communications, and arranges advance dates where possible.

Mr. Brown accompanies his report with impressive testimonials from those who have arranged successful meetings. Prof. Robert Fry Clark, of the Department of Economics and Sociology at Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio, writes: “We were glad indeed to have you here and hope you may be able to come again.”

Prof. Mitchell, of Johns Hopkins, says: “Mr. Brown is by all odds the most acceptable outside speaker that has come to the University in any department in years.”

L. N. Deniston, president of the West Hartford, Conn., Chamber of Commerce, writes: “That you have made a lasting impression is certain, for those who heard you still discuss the topic, and many want you to return.”

Prof. E. J. Urwick, of the University of Toronto, Ontario, writes: “Both on my own part and on that of all my colleagues I should like to express our very grateful thanks for the delightful and stimulating address you were kind enough to give to our Commerce Club.”

Joseph J. Moran, President of the Moran Business College, Kingston, N. Y., writes: “A man who can present so intricate a subject lucidly and entertainingly must, indeed, be an educator of high rank. Many express the

wish that you return in order that they may learn more of the solution of the tax problem."

R. W. Swetland, Headmaster of the Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J., writes: "You certainly made a great hit with the boys as well as with me, and I shall be most happy to have you come again next fall."

R. W. McGriffin, President Marietta (Ohio) Commercial College, writes: "The students got some ideas from your speech that should be of everlasting value to them."

These commendations are from very recent communications to Mr. Brown and show a gratifying response to the message this indefatigable lecturer brings to his widely distributed audiences.

Mr. Brown's lecture assignments for February of this year were given in our last issue. Following is a list of lectures made in the month of March:

Wednesday, 5th: Irvington, N. J., High School, 8.45 A. M. Paterson, N. J., Civic Club, 4.00 P. M.

Thursday, 6th: Danbury, Conn., State Normal School, 10.30 A. M. Bethel, Conn., High School, 1.25 P. M.

Friday, 7th: Canaan, Conn., No. Canaan High School, 2.30 P. M.

Monday, 10th: Plainville, Conn., High School, 11.00 A. M. New Haven, Conn., Stone College, 2.15 P. M.

Tuesday, 11th: Westfield, N. J., Rotary Club, 12.15, noon.

Wednesday, 12th: Ocean City, N. J., High School, 9.00 A. M. Beach Haven, N. J., Exchange Club, evening.

Thursday, 13th: Westfield, N. J., Board of Realtors, 8.30 P. M.

Friday, 14th: New York, N. Y., Dwight School, 11.40 A. M. Waldwick, N. J., Young People's League, evening.

Monday, 17th: Northampton, Mass., High School, 8.30 A. M. Northampton, Mass., Kiwanis Club, 12.15, noon. Northampton, Mass., Rotary Club, 6.15 P. M.

Tuesday, 18th: So. Hadley Falls, Mass., So. Hadley High School, 8.20 A. M. Turners Falls, Mass., Rotary Club, noon.

Wednesday, 19th: Chicopee, Mass., High School, 10.05 A. M. Springfield, Mass., Bay Path Institute, 2.15 P. M.

Thursday, 20th: Springfield, Mass., Exchange Club, noon. Springfield, Mass., Central High School, 2.30 P. M. Auburn, Mass., Men's Club and Grange, 8.30 P. M.

Friday, 21st: Windsor, Conn., The Loomis Institute, 12.00 noon. So. Manchester, Conn., Manchester High School, 2.30 P. M.

Monday, 24th: Saugus, Mass., Saugus High School, 9.00 A. M. Boston, Mass., Hickox Secretarial School, noon. Boston, Mass., Boston University School of Law, 4.00 P. M. Boston, Mass., College of Physicians and Surgeons.

Tuesday, 25th: Brockton, Mass., High School, 8.50 A. M. Brockton, Mass., High School, 9.30 A. M. Newton, Mass., Kiwanis Club, noon.

Wednesday, 26th: Waterbury, Conn., Post's Business College, 10.30 A. M. Waterbury, Conn., Kiwanis Club, 12.15, noon.

Thursday, 27th: Boston, Mass., Boston University Theological Department, 11.40 P. M. Brockton, Mass., Rotary Club, 6:15 P. M.

Friday, 28th: So. Braintree, Mass., Thayer Academy, 8.30 A. M. Taunton, Mass., Bristol Co. Business College, 11.00 A. M. So. Braintree, Mass., Rotary Club, evening.

Monday, 31st: Newburyport, Mass., High School, 11:40 A. M. Lawrence, Mass., Cannon's Commercial College, 2.30 P. M.

A partial list of April engagements follows:

Tuesday 1st: Worcester, Mass., Becker College, 9.00 A. M. Worcester, Mass., Lions Club, 12.00, noon.

Thursday, 3rd: Westfield, Mass., High School, 11.30 A. M. Westfield, Mass., Kiwanis Club, 12.15, noon.

Friday, 4th: Springfield, Mass., Rotary Club, 12.15, noon.

Tuesday, 8th: Newark, N. J., Reciprocity Club, evening.

Thursday, 17th: Port Jervis, N. Y., Kiwanis Club, evening.

Wednesday, 23rd: Baltimore, Md., Morgan College, 10.45 A. M. Baltimore, Md., History Club of Baltimore City College, 2.30 P. M.

Thursday, 24th: Baltimore, Md., Polytechnic Institute, 12.00, noon. Westminster, Md., Western Maryland College, afternoon.

Friday, 25th: Washington, D. C., George Washington University, 6.00 P. M.

Monday, 28th: Williamsburgh, Va., College of William and Mary.

Tuesday, 29th: Williamsburg, Va., College of William and Mary.

Many of these dates in April left unfilled will be taken up before the month is completed.

An Impressive Indictment

DR. HAVEN EMERSON, of the Columbia University Medical School faculty, in an address at the formal dedication of the new Institute of Mental Hygiene at the Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia, said that we were creating conditions as "unbearable for human beings as conditions which existed in the front line trenches during the World War."

He declared that much of the wreckage of mind and nerve today was due to fear, which was induced in no small degree by unemployment, by depression, by the "sudden realization of people capable of working for their living that they have no means of support; that there is no place for them in this vaunted modern civilization."

Will not other authorities speak out as frankly?

Dinner of the Manhattan Single Tax Club

(REPORTED BY ELMA DAME)

ON Tuesday evening, February 11, a dinner was given by the Manhattan Single Tax Club of New York City at the Hotel Woodstock, to celebrate the fifteenth anniversary of the presidency of James R. Brown.

It was felt by the directors and members of the Club that the day Mr. Brown assumed the reins of the club had marked the beginning of a new era—a turning-point—in the life of the club and in the history of the Single Tax movement. During these fifteen years Mr. Brown has devoted his whole time to the affairs of the club and to extending a practical knowledge of the Single Tax by his lectures and writings, by newspaper publicity and personal work. It was therefore deemed a fitting thing that recognition of his work be given at this time, and that he be offered an opportunity to give an account of his stewardship.

About eighty persons were present at the dinner. Mr. Richard Eyre presided. Numerous letters and telegrams of appreciation were read from members and friends who were unable to be present. Among these were messages from Charles T. Root, Tom Work on behalf of Buffalo Single Taxers, Alfred Bishop Mason, Grace Isabel Colbron, Mary Fels, Charles J. Ogle on behalf of Maryland Single Taxers, Allen L. Smith, who spoke for "thousands of Canadians," Samuel Seabury, Josiah Dudley, William Lloyd Garrison, Jr., Dr. Solis Cohen, E. W. Doty, R. Louis Lloyd, Frances S. Boulton, Edwin J. Jones and others.

Mr. Root's letter pointed out that under Mr. Brown's leadership the Manhattan Single Tax Club had become a focal point from which the doctrine of Henry George had spread throughout the Western Hemisphere. He stressed the simplicity and directness with which Mr. Brown delivers the central message of the Single Tax, disencumbering it from controversy, condemnation and metaphysical subtlety, and thus opening instead of closing the minds of his hearers to the moral rightness and the far reaching economic benefits of land value taxation.

The speakers were:

Rev. James F. Halliday, pastor of the First Church Congregational, West Hartford, Connecticut, and author of "Robbing Youth of Its Religion,"—a book that is stirring the minds of the theologians. Mr. Halliday was formerly leader of a Forum in Binghamton, N. Y., at which Mr. Brown had spoken.

Professor H. H. Seay, Jr., of the Department of Economics of the University of Richmond—an enthusiastic Single Taxer who arranged no less than eleven lectures for Mr. Brown in his university in 1928 and as many in 1929, and who will do the same again this year.

George H. Cless, Jr., Secretary of the Chamber of Com-

merce, Glen Falls, N. Y., and formerly holding the same position in Portsmouth, Va., where he heard Mr. Brown preach the gospel years ago.

Charles H. Ingersoll told of the deep impression made upon his mind by Mr. Brown's mode of presentation which he had witnessed before classes of high school students. It was a revelation to him in its simplicity and clarity, and constituted what he called "the very height of efficient propaganda."

Impromptu speakers called upon and responding with fervor were Otto K. Dorn, Joseph Dana Miller, Arthur C. Pleydell, Louis F. Bachrach, Walter Fairchild and Anna George DeMille.

The addresses of the evening in general gave evidence not only of deep intellectual appreciation of this devoted apostle of the Single Tax but also of the warmest personal affection.

Last of all, James R. Brown gave his own inimitable account of his work, which has extended all over the United States and many parts of Canada. He said that it is obviously impossible to lay the whole groundwork of a sound economics within the scope of a single lecture. So he drives straight at taxation, and by concrete examples of the stupidity and iniquity of the present system or lack of system, copiously illustrated with incident and intermixed with a laugh, he holds the attention and enlists the sympathy of his hearers from the start. His addresses are delivered before university classes, high school students, Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs, women's clubs, Young Men's Christian Association groups and the like. In a word, his audiences represent the classes that influence public opinion, the kind of person who will shape the thought of the future. Everywhere he is heard with enthusiasm and is invited to return. The doors of a dozen universities are open to him. He returns year after year with his message, which is delivered to an ever-growing number of students.

It is his universal practice to visit the tax office of a town he is about to lecture in, and obtain the exact figures and data bearing upon its taxation,—learning its population, the number of lots, their valuation, etc., so that he can make his talk very concrete and interesting for every local audience. The heart of his message—first, last and always—is that taxation is payment for social service, and that land value is the reflection, and therefore the true measure, of that service.

OUR present land laws cause a greater drag upon trade and are a greater peril to the standard of living than all the tariffs of Germany and America, and even our own colonies. * * * What we believe is that with even a moderate application of the principle of land value taxation something appreciable may be done to lighten the burden of house rent, to diminish the evils of crowding, and to relieve the pressure on manufactures.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.

Cleveland Conditions Badly Mixed

REV. FERNANDO HOOKER GROOM, D.D., of the Franklin Circle Christian Church of Cleveland, O., delivered a sermon, Feb. 9, on "The Tragedy of the Unemployed." He blamed overproduction, or what he called "mass production," also improved machinery; seasonal occupations; misfit workers; and lack of vocational training. He wanted employers to hire laborers, and actually declared that "factories own other people's jobs." According to the reverend gentleman, it is an "economic sin" for a citizen to paint his own house or shovel the snow from his sidewalk; he should hire it done. Even the lady of the house is almost committing a crime if she does her own house cleaning; she should sit back, fold her hands, and pay some other woman to keep the house clean. And he believes that every man is "his brother's keeper." Not a hint that poverty and unemployment may be due to social violation of a natural law. In short, the Rev. Fernando Hooker Groom, D.D., gave a fine exhibition of what David Gibson, publisher of the *Lorain (Ohio) Journal*, calls "economic illiteracy." The Rev. Fernando Hooker Groom said: "Charity is a necessity, of course, but many now receiving charity need a chance." The chance, however, according to this pulpit orator, is something to be given to the unemployed by citizens who are in good circumstances, and he does not perceive that that is merely another form of charity. He demands "public works on a vast scale when times are slack." He hints cautiously at the 5-day week, and says government should "stabilize employment," whatever that means.

An Ohio disciple of Henry George sent to Dr. Groom a copy of "Single Tax—What It Is and Why We Urge It;" also a respectful letter giving twelve brief paragraphic comments on his sermon.

On Lincoln's birthday, Dr. Groom, who was a war chaplain some years ago, addressed the Reserve Officers' Association, repeating much of what he said in his Sunday sermon. In the meantime, about 1,500 unemployed, organized by Communists, had marched to the City Hall to attend a council committee meeting on the question of providing jobs. As all could not squeeze into the committee room, the police tried to keep the disappointed ones from filling the City Hall entrance and to keep a lane open for others who had business in the building. This led to a riot in which twenty-two were injured—one at least seriously so. Dr. Groom said: "While rioters at City Hall yesterday were wrong in asking the city to pick jobs for them out of thin air, they were right in principle. Municipalities do have the unemployment problem to face just as they have the problem of disease. We have been fed up on too much prosperity talk when 2,300,000 men are without any sort of work. * * * During the war the government performed a wonderful service

in finding men for jobs, and now could do good by finding jobs for men."

There are said to be 1,500 reserve officers in Cleveland, and the association officials promised to circularize them, asking that they give jobs to the needy.

In the same newspapers bearing news of the meeting of the reserve officers, appeared a glowing article by the Chamber of Commerce, predicting a population for the city in 1950 of 2,000,000. One company would move from South Bend, Ind., to Cleveland, bringing 200 men. This brought joy to Cleveland land owners and speculators, but must have been depressing to South Bend's speculators.

One Ohio pulpiteer is boldly declaring that "we have too many people here;" the Communists are the busiest propagandists in Cleveland, and assert that the cause of poverty is to be found in private ownership of capital. Occasionally, a Single Taxer mildly calls attention to land speculation and harmful taxes. The group of ardent young Liberals in Cleveland is too excited about politics to take interest in the poverty problem, and changing the form of the city government seems to them more important than any other public question at present. The Cleveland Real Estate Board is interested in increasing population, in rising land values, and in reducing the amount of revenue derived by the land value tax. Ohio has a tax amendment pushed through by chambers of commerce and real estate boards, and a new law for taxing personal property will be made if the bankers and land speculators are able to agree. It will act as a handicap on capital and labor.

The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce proceeds on the theory that what Cleveland needs is more people, higher land values, lower taxes on land, and the open shop.

Cleveland's purveyors of daily news pay most attention to crimes, prohibition, politics and town booming. Editorially they take the side of the land speculators in taxation, and cannot be induced to discuss poverty and unemployment in any other than the extreme conventional style, which is inoffensive to those who own the land of the city and are able to make the masses pay them for the mere privilege of living and working.

What will happen as a result of the poor thinking, cowardice, rapacity, and apathy now seen in Cleveland? The city has no outstanding leader either for good or evil. It is a dangerous situation.

Communists ask the Associated Charities to maintain a 3-cent soup kitchen on the Public Square. The charity people reply that near the square are five restaurants in which a bowl of soup with meat can be had for 5 cents; also that the Associated Charities are feeding 400 men and women daily at their Wayfarer's Lodge, where there is "plenty of food for every hungry man or woman in the city." They have a 25 cent meal of soup, round steak, potatoes, bread and butter, rice pudding and coffee. If the applicant has no 25 cents, he can "chop a bit of wood"

and thereby earn a meal of soup, crackers and coffee. In spite of these generous (?) provisions, every man who is on the down-town streets frequently is stopped by appeals for assistance.

Organized Cleveland charity workers proceed on the assumption that theirs is a permanent profession for a constantly increasing number of citizens.

It is announced that Representative Chester C. Bolton, of Cleveland, will introduce into Congress a bill to create a National Employment Bureau, with at least eight branches. This is the political method favored by President Hoover. To the creation of government agencies and offices there is no end. It postpones the day when a fundamental remedy must be considered, and it supplies the boys with jobs which will never be abolished unless a political revolution comes along.

The Methodist Council of Cities was in session in Cleveland when the unemployed and the police had their fighting at the City Hall. The Council adopted resolutions calling for more officers and for federal legislation granting sickness, accident and unemployment insurance as well as old-age pensions "to our workers," and declaring that "any industry which would claim Christian commendation" must pay "a living wage for the entire year." They said that "in the industrial order envisaged by the church," unemployment would be eliminated. This is a hint at the abolition of poverty, and is the only encouraging sign Cleveland has had.

Cleveland clergymen are preaching the New Testament doctrine of love rather than the Old Testament idea of social justice. The rabbis, apparently, ignore the poverty problem, or talk of unemployment insurance.

John W. Love, popular columnist for the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, writes that in explaining the cause of poverty, others may talk of Malthus, Marx and Henry George; but he himself depends upon the "statistical method."

It may be an error to say that the hint at the abolition of poverty, given by the Methodist Council of Cities, is the only encouraging sign in Cleveland, for the fact that a prominent clergyman like the Rev. Fernando Hooker Groom, D.D., in spite of his muddled thinking, declares that the unemployed "need a chance," may direct some minds to asking: "What kind of a chance?" What Dr. Groom means by the word "chance" is clear, but it has a wider application. Yet Dr. Groom is the first of Cleveland's pulpiteers to have the courage to protest against "too much prosperity talk." His heart is in the right place, and his efforts may save some of the unemployed from extreme despair and desperation.

The Cleveland Engineering Society has jumped into the fierce discussion over unemployment, and 300 engineers held a meeting on the subject. One speaker advocates compelling wives to refrain from working for wages. Another blamed the schools "which failed to instruct boys and girls in the problems of life." Still another declared "that most of men unemployed could find or create

work for themselves if they tried hard enough." The meeting broke up in a chaos of opinions. Structures planned by engineers would be unstable if carried out with such bad thinking.

Barnett R. Brickner, popular rabbi of the Euclid Avenue Temple, discussed unemployment at a meeting of the Ohio Egg and Poultry Association. Is not that funny? He wants employment insurance and old-age pensions, and favored a government revolving fund to "provide work during economic depressions." It would "provide work," a good deal as the house wife makes work for herself when she spills grease on the kitchen floor. Rabbi Brickner said not a word as to how the government could get the money to "provide work," or how it ought to be obtained. All of the unemployment agitators dodge that delicate phase of the problem of "letting the government do it," and will say nothing displeasing to landowners and speculators.

How Henry George's Books are Distributed

WITH REFERENCE PARTICULARLY TO THE
PLACING OF BOOKS IN SCHOOLS
AND COLLEGES

EARLY IN 1926, when the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation first began its work, an unabridged edition of "Progress and Poverty" by Henry George, was contracted for, published under the Doubleday Page imprint, but sponsored and paid for by the Foundation. A thousand copies especially bound for library use were promptly placed in as many public and college libraries throughout the country.

Since that time, through the splendid cooperation of Single Taxers everywhere, who have purchased books in great quantities to give away to interested persons, or perhaps to sell at nominal cost; through the work of the Foundation in interesting professors in schools and colleges; through the Annie C. George Prize Essay contests and the Hussey Fund contests, and finally through a systematic advertising programme, there has sprung up a steady demand for "Progress and Poverty," as well as the other books available from the Foundation. Last July a fine, 50th Anniversary Edition of the unabridged work was brought out under the Foundation's own imprint, and the sales and donations have been such that a second printing of this edition is now about to be launched.

In January, 1928, the popular book "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty" by Henry George, compiled by Professor Harry Gunnison Brown, and prefaced with Professor John Dewey's remarkable INTRODUCTION, came off the press. As Mr. Fairchild explains elsewhere this little book meets the requirements of many

of the teachers of economics, and it found a ready welcome as a text book and as a reference book. We found a few orders coming in to us from professors of economics, for fifty, seventy-five or more books at a time. That gave us an idea. With the start of the 1928 Semester, a letter was addressed to professors of economics throughout the country calling attention to our special prices for the book in quantities and offering a sample copy. The many letters on file show that the response was instantaneous and cordial. The letter was repeated (in varying form) each Semester and the sale of books has increased. Some 1,000 books have been sold this way. Nor was "Significant Paragraphs" the only marketable book. The unabridged "Progress and Poverty" has proven popular also and is ordered in large quantities by certain universities, and there is a steady demand for Louis F. Post's books. "Significant Paragraphs" has come through three editions of 5,000, 2,500 and 5,000 respectively, and it will not be long before a fourth edition is announced.

Lest there appear a taint of commercialism in this brief resume of sales of books, we would like to state that in all cases postage (which is a considerable item) is prepaid by the Foundation, and quantities of books are always sold at a cost below, or equivalent to the actual printing costs. This does not take into account the cost of the making of plates, which is not considered when the prices are fixed. Moreover thousands of copies of books and pamphlets have been freely given to college libraries, to professors, and wherever it is felt the need is great and the interest alive and real.—ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN.

Taxation

LET me quote a statement from the immortal Thomas Paine: "When it shall be said in any country in the world, my poor are happy, neither ignorance nor distress is to be found among them, my jails are empty of prisoners, my streets of beggars, the aged are not in want, the taxes are not oppressive, the rational world is my friend because I am the friend of its happiness, when these things can be said, then may that country boast of its constitution and its government."

I never read these lines without feeling something stir within me, for these lines are so practical and also so impressive, for it is the truth in statements that stirs and inspires the normal mind.

It is over one hundred and fifty years since Paine wrote those words. Would it not be well to inquire, are we today much nearer the objective set forth in those lines; what progress have we made?

We have plenty of poor, for the life of the ordinary working man is the life of a poor man, a week out of work and he is in debt. The life of the ordinary small store keeper is the life of the poor man; for financial worries are always with him. And is it not true that ignorance abounds, do

not a vast majority of our people believe monstrous things so inconsistent with facts? If they were not dreadfully ignorant, how could they believe them, and how ignorant the most of our people are on vital questions of great importance.

Take the tax question, for instance. How many people know anything about it? We all growl and we all complain, but how many seriously and intelligently think on this problem?

The jails are not yet empty; the fact is they are worse crowded than they ever were in any period of the history of the United States. We have a larger percentage today of our people in jail than we have had since Washington crossed the Delaware.

The aged have not been saved from want and the fear of want. One dark thought that comes into the minds of all our people, at least to an overwhelming majority of them, is what will I do in order to live when I am old, and in many thousands of cases it is either the charity of relatives or the poor house.

What about the burden of taxes? Are taxes oppressive or are they not? I would say, most emphatically, they are oppressive. The total bill of this country, federal, state and local, is said to be for 1927, over Twelve Billion Dollars, and with a population of one hundred and twenty million, that means One Hundred Dollars per capita for every man, woman and child. For a family of five, it means Five Hundred Dollars a year that people on the average have to pay in taxes. But someone says, ah, the rich pay nearly all of that. Do they? Where do they get it and how do they get it? Is it not by taking it through monopolistic power from those who produce wealth, thereby making anything they pay into the tax fund a collection of the earnings of laborers and capitalists who enjoy no privilege and have no monopoly? So finally all the costs of government, as well as the support of the idle rich, comes out of industry and results in lowering wages and diminishing the return to capital.

If Paine could come back and look around, take a journey up Fifth Avenue and see the magnificence of our splendor, or take a walk down south Fifth Avenue and see the depths of our poverty and degradation of human life, I wonder what he would say?

JAMES R. BROWN, in *Yonkers Workman*.

Taxation and Prosperity

THE usual comment of those in comfortable conditions, when speaking of the less fortunate class, is that if the masses were more industrious, frugal and intelligent, their lot in life would be vastly improved; would in fact, be quite equal to their own; that they are the makers of their own condition.

This attitude on the part of the more fortunate dulls the sense of responsibility they might otherwise feel did

they understand better the real cause producing so much of the poverty to be found everywhere. Also, it is flattering to the well-to-do to imagine that, in a country like ours, where all are politically equal and the humblest rise to high places in government and business, that they forged ahead of their fellows by sheer force of merit; for all of which they have only themselves to praise.

A few years ago there died in New York City a Polish immigrant, who had come to this country penniless and friendless some forty years before, and through investments in land on Manhattan Island, amassed a fortune of many millions. The newspaper all over the country told the story of his career, and much editorial comment was devoted to his achievements, and most of the papers—big and little—said it was all due to his business sagacity and judgment.

The fact that this Polish immigrant succeeded to such an extent under handicaps which many would consider as insurmountable, furnished a theme for the editorial writers for quite a spell; he was hailed as an example of what thrift and farsightedness might accomplish for other immigrant boys, and poor native boys, as well. They counselled everybody to make investments in land, watch values grow, and reap fortunes as the Polish immigrant had done. It all sounded like good advice, even though it were not.

Had the writers of the articles analyzed the economic conditions that made for this success, they perhaps would not have been quite so certain that just anyone—nor very many—could do the same, and would have hesitated before stating it as their conclusion that all they had to do was to do it.

The millions of that great city made his wealth for him. As they toiled at the business of making a living, and others come to dwell there, by their presence and industry his wealth grew and grew, though he did no more to make it increase than any other one of the millions. But he got the entire increase. They got nothing. They even paid more rent because he held his land out of use. Was he a public benefactor?

Had the men and women of that city bought land and held it out of use, as the newspaper counseled them to do in emulation of the Polish immigrant, the city could not have grown at all. Then how could value have been created? Questions like this supply their own answers.

We should know how the holding of land out to use affects adversely those who must use it and all must. The quantity of things available fixes the price to the user, and if land be held at a prohibitive price, waiting for a rise, it is, for the time being at least, as though that much land had sunk into the ocean. Others who sell gain an advantage in price by the artificial scarcity created by the one holding his out of use.

If a tax sufficient to compel the bringing of valuable land into use were imposed this would lower ground prices and cause the erection of more buildings, thus benefiting

the man who desired to build a home for his own use, as well as those who build to let to others. There would be more houses built in either case.

Reduced ground values and exemption of buildings from taxation increase the number of buildings, thereby lowering rent; so both the owner and the tenant would be benefitted—the former by reduction in land prices and exemption from taxation of the building, whether occupied, or not; the latter by the increased number of houses available, for the quantity of things available fixes the price to the user, whether it be land, houses, diamonds, or apples.

Every saving effected in the price of land, means just that much more return to labor for its exertions. And whenever desirable land, through taxation, is forced into use—whether in city, town, or country—it means less resort to disadvantageous locations. Take the country for instance: If desirable land—that adjacent to cities and towns—were not held out of use by fictitious, speculative prices, there would be no necessity for rural dwellers to make their homes in remote sections and compel them to the cultivation of inferior soil, the combined disadvantages preventing them from making a living under even the best conditions otherwise. They are not there by choice; they are forced there by our barbaric taxation system, which allows the few to reap what all have sown.

The only way on earth to bring desirable land into use is to tax it in an amount equal to what users would pay for its annual use. Then land prices would come down to actual value; and not until then will communities develop and be prosperous. A sure foothold—security of possession—will enable them to dwell in peace and plenty, and by cooperation, have all the modern conveniences denied them individually under present conditions.

Take by taxation the value created by the whole people, and the benefits that would accrue—moral, social, political, economic—stagger the imagination in contemplation. No question of charity is involved—only justice. Charity! charity! we hear so much about it we come to think it is the only remedy for poverty. But it is not; it is not. Charity cannot usurp the functions of justice, for justice is first. It is the chief cornerstone of the temple. It is the stone the builders rejected.

The Single Tax means Justice in action; it means equality and freedom for all, oppression of none. It is so simple, we hesitate to believe it can be so potent. We are baffled by its very simplicity, but shall we turn away from it for that reason? Where shall we look?

J. F. COLBERT (Member of Louisiana Tax Commission) in the *Shreveport Journal*.

INSTEAD of subduing poverty and inducing the poor to go out and inherit the earth, many of us wish to keep them crowded here, because their poverty is their inducement to labor for us rich.—JEAN INGELow.

The Essential Reform

In lieu of the article addressed to "The Man in the Street," promised in last issue, we print the following from P. J. Markham, of Melbourne, Australia. This is the Henry George Foundation Prize Leaflet, No. 2, and is an admirable statement of our principles, understandable, we think, by even those wholly unfamiliar with economic discussion.

THE reform known as the Single Tax rests on two basic principles—

(a) All the Community have an equal right to life, and as this can only be secured by access to Natural Elements—the free gifts of Nature—all have an equal right to these gifts.

(b) Each individual has exclusive right to the product of his own labor.

The first of these rights is the more important; indeed, the second is subject to it. For the individual right of property in goods produced by labor can only be secured by treating all the elements of Nature as the common property of the community.

THE CATEGORY OF LAND

If we look at the special characteristics of Land—of Land in the ordinary sense—its difference from other forms of Property will be readily seen. The late Lord Strathclyde, formerly Lord Advocate for Scotland, enumerated some of these as follows:—

(1) Land comes from the Creator; it does not owe its existence in any sense to men.

(2) It is limited in quantity; we cannot add to its area.

(3) It is necessary for man's very existence, for production and for the exchange of products.

(4) The value of Land is independent of the improvements upon it.

(5) Its value is not due to the owner; it is due to the presence, activity and demand of the community.

(6) Its value ever increases with social development.

(7) It cannot be carried away or concealed.

(8) A Tax upon Land or Land Values cannot be shifted.

Let the reader ask himself: Can he name any other property answering to that description? Surely not! These special qualities place Land in a category by itself.

The right to exclusive individual ownership of things produced by Labor—all of which may be embraced in the term Wealth—must be recognized. But the same ownership cannot apply to Land, upon access to which our very existence depends. For, above all civil law, there exists a Natural Law, by which the earth is the property of all the people. Nature has provided the Common Right, but this has not been recognized, and the bounty goes to the few, while the many are dispossessed.

The aim of the Single Tax Movement is to re-assert

the Common Right; to bring it into general recognition and operation by Legal Enactment.

COMMONSENSE PROPOSALS

In asserting the Common Right, Single Taxers do not propose the impossible task of dividing up the Land among the people, nor is it proposed that Government should become the sole landlord. How we should proceed is clearly set out by Henry George in "The Condition of Labor:"—

"We do not propose to keep Land common—letting any one use any part of it at any time. We do not propose dividing Land in equal shares; still less the impossible task of keeping it so divided.

"We propose leaving Land in the private possession of individuals, with full liberty on their part to give, sell or bequeath it; and simply to levy on it for public uses a tax that shall equal the annual value of the Land itself, irrespective of the use made of it or the improvements on it.

"We would accompany this Tax on Land Values with the repeal of all taxes now levied on the products and processes of industry, which taxes, since they take from the earnings of Labor, we hold to be infringements of the right property.

"The taking for common uses of the value that attaches to Land, irrespective of any exertion of Labor on it, combines the advantages of Private Possession of Land with the justice of Common Ownership of Land Values.

"It expresses the same principle as where a human father leaves equally to his children things not susceptible of specific division or common use. In that case such things would be sold or rented, and the value equally applied.

"It is on this commonsense principle that we, who term ourselves Single Tax men, would have the community act.

"This we propose, not as a cunning device of human ingenuity, but as a conforming of human regulations to the will of God."

BACK TO THE LAND

The moral basis of the claim to the Common Ownership of Land Values, and that the increasing fund of Land Rent is a provision to meet the ever-growing wants of Social Government, and its collection, if it may be called a tax, is Natural Taxation, is strikingly supported in the famous Pastoral Letter of the Most Rev. Dr. Nulty, Bishop of Meath, known as "Back to the Land." Read carefully the following extracts, and note Dr. Nulty's absolute assurance on these points. He says:—

"On the strength of authority as well as of reason, I may fairly infer that the people are, and always must be, the real owners of the Land of their country. This great social fact is of incalculable importance, and it is fortunate

indeed that on the strictest principle of justice, it is not clouded by even a shadow of uncertainty or doubt.

"There is, moreover, a charm and peculiar beauty in the clearness with which it reveals the wisdom and the benevolence of the designs of Providence, in the admirable provision He has made for the wants and necessities of that state of Social Existence in which the very instincts of nature tell us we are to spend our lives."

Then, as to the sufficiency of Land Values:—

"One of the most interesting peculiarities of this property is that its value is never stationary; it is constantly progressive and increasing in a direct ratio to the growth of the population; and the very causes that increase and multiply the demands made upon it increase proportionately its ability to meet them."

The Bishop of Meath sounded the slogan, "Back to the Land." Single Tax is the method of achievement.

EQUITABLE TAXATION

Under the Single Tax plan, all values created by individual use or improvement would be exempted from taxation, and the only value taken into consideration would be that attaching to the bare Land by reason of situation, etc. The farmer, therefore, would pay no more than the man who held Land of equal value idle; and the man who, on a city lot, erected a valuable building would be taxed no more than the speculator who held a similar lot vacant.

The Single Tax would thus call upon men to contribute to the public revenues, not in proportion to what they produce or accumulate, but in proportion to the value of the Natural Opportunities they hold.

This principle of raising Governmental revenue speaks for itself. It is founded on justice, while the present methods are unjust both in conception and incidence.

DOUBLE-TAXERS

Our present methods of raising revenue consists mostly of taxes on labor and labor products, and those who object to the Single Tax must subscribe to some, if not all, of the many multiple taxes with which we are burdened.

Whether the people know it or not, Government is taking by taxation part of the product of each individual worker. His real wages are thus reduced in a dozen different ways, by forms of taxation which sometimes are given little heed to.

Just to mention a few of them. The Income Tax is inquisitorial, and falls most heavily upon the honest man. Customs Duties at borders and seaports are a negation of the Brotherhood of Man, and breed enmity between nations; they hamper trade, make goods dear, and are a specially cruel infliction on the poor. Taxes on Buildings and Improvements restrict enterprise and penalize industry. Then there are Excise Duties, Probate Duties-Stamp Duties, Amusement Taxation, etc., all manifestly

unjust; yet, for lack of advanced knowledge among the people, such taxes are in general use in almost every country throughout the world. The introduction of the Single Tax would be accompanied by the wiping away of all these expedients, none of which conforms to Natural Law.

WHAT IS PROPOSED

A good description of what is proposed would be "Not a Single Tax!"

It is proposed to abolish all present taxes, and to resume Ground Rent—or Land Values—for the use of the community, and to describe this resumption of Rent as taxation is really not correct; but on account of usage, the term may stand.

The system, then, as its name implies, means one tax. Abolishing all present taxes, a Single Tax is to be levied on the value of Land; this without regard to the use made of the Land and of the improvements upon it.

It is not a tax on real estate, for real estate includes improvements. Nor is it a Tax on Land, but on Land Values—a vastly different thing. These Land Values would be taxed fully. If the holder of Land improved it, he would be charged no more; if he neglected the Land, he would be charged no less.

It is not, now, a new tax; for in Australia as elsewhere, Land Values are already taxed for Municipal, State and National revenue purposes. In the Municipal sphere it is proposed to abolish all Rates that now fall upon buildings or other improvements, and to levy all Local Taxation upon Land Values only.

In the State and in the Commonwealth, the reform would abolish present systems of taxation, wipe out the graduations and remove the exemptions under the Land-Values Tax, and would increase that Tax so as to take, as nearly as may be, the whole of the Economic Rent.

ADVANTAGES OF THE SINGLE TAX

By taxing Land in proportion to its market value those holding it idle would be induced either to use it or let others use it on fair terms. Thus, by making Land available to use, it would enormously increase the production of wealth, and it would further stimulate production by removing the burden of taxation which industry now bears.

It would get rid of taxes which promote fraud, perjury and corruption, and which tax what the nation can least afford to spare—honesty and conscience.

Since Land lies out of doors and cannot be removed or concealed, and as its value is the most readily ascertained of all values, the Single Tax on Land Values could be collected with the minimum of cost and the least strain on public morals.

Other advantages would be the dispensing with an army of tax gatherers and other officials which our present taxes require, and the placing in the Treasury of a revenue

which would make Government more independent of lobbyists and wirepullers, and consequently purer.

JUSTICE THE OBJECT

The operation of the Single Tax would mean deriving the greatest product from the Land, by applying the Free Trade principle to Production as well as to Exchange.

As you cannot have trade without Production, which begins with the Land, it is absurd to talk of Freedom of Trade while penalizing Production at its source. Our present system of taxation does this, and further hampers trade in many ways, the result being to lessen production.

Single Tax, in practice, would open up the Land to the people, place Rents and Wages on their Natural Level, and establish for all time a sound system of Land-tenure.

Giving complete freedom to Production and Exchange, it would tend to the fullest development of the resources of the country and would enrich the nation.

Freedom of access to Land would lessen the causes of discontent at home; with Freedom of Overseas Trade, we would reduce the risk of trouble abroad.

The raising of Public Revenue from the proper source would give free play to co-operation and trade, bringing the nations closer together, and eventually establishing Internationalism.

Thus, the Single Tax is not advocated solely as a means for raising revenue. Merely as such it would not command the whole-souled devotion of men in every country throughout the world.

The object of the Single Tax is to achieve Economic Justice.

THE POWER OF TRUTH

We earnestly ask readers to study the Single Tax question for themselves. Being a truth, it will bear the closest scrutiny. It can hardly be hoped that this article will of itself make converts; but it may, at least, cause some to look closer into the matter. Henry George realized how difficult it is to win people from old convictions when he wrote:—

"The truth which I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be, it would have been accepted long ago. If that could be, it would never have been obscured. But it will find friends—those who will toil for it, suffer for it, if need be *die for it*. This is the power of truth."

And now we ask the reader to mark this final word from the same author—which is at once an appeal and a challenge:—

"Try our remedy by any test. The test of justice, the test of expediency. Try it by any dictum of political economy; by any maxim of good morals; by any maxim of good government. *It will stand the test*. I ask you not to take what I or any other man may say, but think for yourselves."

Many Make Fortunes For the Few

ONE hundred years ago Columbia University received a grant of 11 acres of land in the city of New York from the State. The first tenant was unable to make the rent of \$500, and gave up the lease. The trustees were peeved at the president of the college for accepting the land in lieu of a small grant in money. Later the tract was laid out in streets, and improved with private houses, the lots being leased to the builders by the college. The tract consists of three blocks from Fifth Avenue to Sixth Avenue and from 47th to 50th Streets, in the heart of the city, excepting a strip 100 ft. deep on Sixth Avenue and a similar strip in one of the blocks at the Fifth Avenue end. This whole tract has recently been leased for a term of 100 years by the trustees of the university to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., at a rental of \$3,000,000, and taxes which will be about \$1,375,000 more a year. This gives the property an estimated value of at least \$60,000,000. Many of the houses have long since been converted to business and more recently to "speakeasies" or "bootleg" purposes. Columbia has had a substantial income from the leases for years.

The transaction serves well to visualize economic rent as a basis of taxation. The owners did nothing to increase the value of this land. The increase was all created by the people who came and made the city their home and place of business. In other words, the community created the extra value, and gave it to the owner. Fortunately in this case it goes to an educational institution, but in other cases it goes to individuals. The increase of rental for the next 100 years will all go to Mr. Rockefeller and people yet unborn. If we made economic rent of income on land the basis of taxation instead of property, these unearned rents, in whole or in part as required, would go to pay the cost of government and replace other taxes.

The land value in these 11 acres is equal to the estimated land value of 17,600 average farms in the State of New York, or more than one-tenth of the total farm land values of the State. *The Rural New Yorker*, Feb. 1.

Future of American Cities

THE annual dinner for the League for Industrial Democracy, New York, Dec. 27th, was made the occasion for discussing city problems which are becoming daily more portentous. Norman Thomas, who made such a surprising run for mayor on the Socialist ticket at the last election, was one of the speakers. He said the "good government" movement is of negligible value in the building of a better city, there is more to city government than honesty and efficiency. "Good government does not touch special privilege and has no social programme when it does get into power * * * * With such a barren

programme no movement should stand in the way of the positive social philosophy which is necessary for the rebuilding of the city and of which the doctrine that land values are created by society and belong to it plays an important part. For unless that fact is taken into consideration no system of replanning the city is possible nor will it be possible for the city to escape from the dangers which at present are attacking it on all sides."

Another speaker, Stuart Chase, said the city of the present is planned for real estate speculation and human welfare is only a by-product, and there is therefore a very great possibility of catastrophe. The increasing congestion which gives us a growing accident rate, deafening noise, the dome of dust over the city, will finally make the city uninhabitable or lead to a technical breakdown. Three factors have made possible the tremendous growth of the city—the elevator, which makes possible the skyscraper; the development of rapid transit and the extension system for the water supply that is indispensable. The great obstacle to rebuilding the city is inflated land values, which demands more than a king's ransom for a city lot. The technical knowledge is available to remedy the situation but it has not the opportunity to get to work.

The rent of land must come out of production. After we have paid this enormous sum to the non-producers of this land we still have the government expense to settle. A mentality test in use in some institutions is to allow a faucet to overflow; patients are equipped with pails and cloths and sent to the room; the feeble-minded mop patiently at the endless task, but those with a glimmer of reason left shut off the faucet.

WINIFRED B. COSSETTE in Quincy, (Mass.) *Patriot Ledger*.

What the Great Scotsman Saw

THE great Adam Smith, who may properly be styled a precursor of Henry George, points out in his monumental book, usually styled "The Wealth of Nations," that the one great defect in the land tax which had been enacted in England in 1693, is "the constancy of the valuation." Accordingly he maintains that an Act ordaining the valuation of land, the landlord being indemnified for his expenditure, should be "a perpetual and unalterable regulation or fundamental law of the commonwealth." Clearly what the great Scotsman meant was the separate valuation of land and improvements and the exemption of the latter from taxation. True, he does not appear to have realized that what he terms "the ordinary rent of land" when referring to country land, is one and the same thing with what he terms "the ground-rent of houses" when he refers to urban land. Bearing in mind that he was the first in the field of political economy, however, we must realize that Smith missed very little, inasmuch as he maintains that no tax could be more just or equitable than a tax upon ground-rent. Readers may think that I

have a lawyer's liking for precedents, but in my opinion one of the most effective arguments in support of our cause may be drawn from the armory of history, and accordingly it seems to me that we do not make sufficient use of the historical fact that a land tax was imposed in England as long ago as 1693, that it was intended to placate the popular disaffection aroused by the abolition of the so-called feudal burdens in 1645, and that the principle of taxing the rent of land, excluding improvements, was advocated by Adam Smith, the founder of political economy, who demanded also that a statute providing for the separate valuation of land and improvements should be a fundamental law. As Henry George once said, "truth is never new," and it will be remembered that he knew the value of history, and so fortified his argument by a chapter in "Progress and Poverty" entitled "Private Property in Land Historically Considered."

HON. P. J. O'REGAN in Auckland, N. Z. *Liberator*.

A Tribute to E. N. Vallindingham

EDWARD NOBLE VALLANDINGHAM, who died Monday in Seville, Spain, was a charming combination of the old and the new South, and the old and new worlds. In the days when "scholar and gentleman" meant intellectual quality, and all that goes with inherited and acquired culture, he would have been classified as both. He impressed one at the first glance and the first meeting, and was just as impressive after years of acquaintance and intimacy. In other days, when the late George F. Babbitt was in his prime, and the late Frank E. Chase participated actively in social affairs, Mr. Vallindingham was at his best, and the three would have held their own with Thackeray and Maginn and their set.

Mr. Vallandigham wrote extremely well. He had a leisurely style which gave grace to any subject which he discussed. There was something in all his essays, as in his human relations, of that North Shore of Maryland which he loved so dearly. He was a close student of history and politics. Where some persons saw merely a series of haphazard unrelated events, he detected the working out of the principles of government. He knew not only things, but the philosophy of things. He wrote many editorials for *The Herald*, and a number of special articles, and had arranged to send us his observations on the foreign trip which has ended so abruptly and so sadly.

A Southerner, he was deeply attached to Boston, proud of its past, and a contributor to the telling of its story. The accelerated tempo of the age did not distress him in the least. He had taken his manners and his educations from the old school, and retained them. He had genuine admiration for the man who worked with his hands. An aristocrat, he had the most scrupulous regard for the social rights of everybody. He lived a simple and satisfying

home life, and, axe on shoulder, swinging at a tree, he was a familiar sight to his Chestnut Hill neighbors. The North End of Boston appealed to him particularly. Roaming among the little shops, he had the courtly deference of his ancestors, and the Italian shopkeepers were always hugely pleased when he entered their little places and instinctively doffed his hat to them. He was a splendid representative of the genuine gentlemen who are unfortunately much less numerous now than a few decades ago.

Editorial *Boston Herald*.

The Riddle of the Sphinx

ROBINSON CRUSOE may have been monarch of all he surveyed, but he was pitiably poor in the necessities and comforts of life because, working alone, he could produce so little. Now, in the midst of Twentieth Century industrial civilization, where the subdivision, specialization and coordination of labor, together with the use of power and machinery, have carried production to the *n*th degree of efficiency, we are offered the preposterous theory that men are poor and out of work because of the abundance of their productions!

Who shall properly diagnose our economic ailment and prescribe an adequate remedy? Recognized economists long since tacitly dropped the subject of economics in its larger aspects to pursue a specialized branch thereof. The "economics" they profess is really business administration. They have substituted an art for what is really a science. Instead of conducting an investigation into what civilization has done that deprives men of the opportunity of making a living unless they are fortunate enough to find a master to hire them, they merely study out ways and means to make the best of an admittedly bad situation. It is not pleasant to charge them with obscurantism, but we cannot otherwise explain their discarding the science for an art.—STEPHEN BELL in *Commerce and Finance*.

LET us not continue living in a fool's paradise. Let us honestly face the fact. We are enmeshed in a vast system of land parasitism. Shrieks of agony will arise at any attempts to eradicate the parasitic growth. But the task of rooting out this cancer must be undertaken or it will destroy, as it has done in past times, the civilization it feeds upon.—*Progress*, Melbourne, Aus.

GOD, by giving to man wants, and making his recourse to work necessary to supply them, has made the right to work the property of every man, and this property is the first, the most sacred, the most imprescriptible of all.—TURGOT.

IF Christianity was understood and taught conformably to the spirit of its founder, the existing social organism could not last a day.

—EMILE DE LAVELAYE, Belgian Economist.

The Underlying Cause of Poverty

IT were idle to question the intelligence and ability of those who so vainly seek to solve the great question of increasing crime and persisting poverty.

Their utter failure is due to their neglect to diagnose the disease, before suggesting a remedy, and a correct diagnosis is as essential for the cure of social disease as for individuals.

What then is the underlying cause of world wide poverty and its manifestations in crime which flourishes everywhere in the shadow of schools and churches, poverty in the midst of plenty, famine amid full granaries?

First, may we agree that some Great Cause has enacted the laws which hold the worlds fixed in their whirling orbits? That we have proof that these laws are unchanging and beneficent? That the universe everywhere attests both the wisdom and the beneficence of this First Great Cause? That it is not conceivable that this Cause would show less intelligence in launching the Good Ship Earth into space than that shown in provisioning and equipping the "Leviathan?"

That, therefore the earth when launched carried ample equipment and provisions for all for the full duration of her voyage?

If then, the cabin passengers are surfeited while those in the steerage starve, this must be due to some action by man which ignores and defies natural law.

Since the effect is world wide, since poverty, starvation and crime flourish in Australia, Africa and Asia as well as in Europe and America, this defiance of natural law which is the cause must be equally wide spread.

In launching the Earth, air, water, land and sunshine were given as the common property of all generations, but the results of man's individual labor exerted on these became his individual property.

The more thoroughly we study the evils of today the more certain is it that their roots are in our treatment of this common property as if it were the fruits of individual effort and therein human law defies natural law.

This enables those to reap who have not sown, and not merely deprives the laborer of his earnings but enables the absentee holder to forbid the use by idle men of idle land to satisfy their hunger.

We have seen recently in Wales and Pennsylvania men shivering with cold above unmined coal, men vainly asking permission to sow crops on untilled land, labor idle because human law forbids men to satisfy their needs as natural law commands.

The only way to really benefit mankind is to teach men how to break down this artificial barrier which alone prevents the use of earth's bounties so that there will everywhere be work for all, food for all, comfort for all, leisure for all.—WILL ATKINSON.

Jesus' Social Economics

JESUS teaches us to pray: "Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Then "Give us this day our daily bread." If in an earthly home the children are all treated equally and justly, how much more so in the family of the Heavenly Father. "The earth hath He given to the children of men." The profit of the earth is for all." He makes sun to shine and the rain to fall on all. Jesus pictures a happy state when we need take no thought for the morrow, but be as wild flowers, fed and cared for by the Heavenly Father. For all of His creatures there is a full and free environment,—free sunlight, free air, free rain and water, and free land to produce from. Paley said "If we saw in a barn yard one good-for-nothing bird sitting there doing nothing and all the other birds pecking and piling up heaps of grain for that good-for-nothing bird for half a day before they could pick for themselves, we would have the condition among birds that exists among men. A few men corner the earth and the rest of us live by their good pleasure. As the Chinese say, "We get our breath from under the other fellow's chin." Jesus ends His words of fairness and justice as He prayed "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as in heaven," by saying, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things (food and clothes) shall be added unto you." If sunlight, air, water and land were free to all, there would be no necessary poverty. It is not a question of dividing the land among all but of dividing the value or rent. All ground rent would go to the public for taxes and public uses and industry, trade and manufacture would be free from taxes. We would all be the landlord and all tenants. Men would hold as little land as possible and there would be plenty for all. House rent would be much lower as there would be fewer vacant lots and more houses. Study Matthew 6 and Nehemiah 5.—W. E. MACKLIN.

Ohio's Opportunity

OHIO'S Constitution now permits the Legislature to abolish the personal property tax. Governor Myers Y. Cooper at Columbus has appointed a committee of 120 to draft a new law under the changed tax provisions. The real estate boards and others who want to retain the personal property tax and to increase the revenue from that source undoubtedly are in the majority of that committee of 120. Ohio citizens who want to get rid of the tax utterly, or to reduce the revenue from it, can write to the governor their reasons in full, and ask him to send the letters to the chairman of the committee. They may do some good. It seems to be taken for granted by the land speculators that the change will result in raising more revenue from bank depositors, mortgage owners, etc., to "relieve real estate from its unjust share of taxation."

Some of them claim to want to "relieve home-owners;" but their real object is to reduce the amount of revenue derived by the tax on land values. Ohio Single Taxers would do well to get busy on this matter, either individually, or collectively, or both.

LeBaron Goeller Lectures at Endicott, N. Y.

CHARLES LEBARON GOELLER lectured at Endicott, N. Y., Feb. 26, in the Central Methodist Episcopal Church. The Binghamton press said of the lecture that it was "splendidly illustrated with lantern slides and diagrams carefully chosen to emphasize the argument."

Mr. Goeller also had a fine meeting at the Binghamton Young Men's Club and two more dates are promised in the near future.

I SUPPOSE, almost alone in the category of social and fiscal reforms, this (taxation of land values) is one which meets with practically the unanimous approval, without distinction of politics or party, of all the great municipalities. * * * What are the two great principles upon which, as far as I understand it, it is founded? They are very simple.

They seem to me to be based upon commonsense and equity.

The first is that those who benefit by public improvements, those who especially benefit by public improvements, should contribute their fair share of the cost of them. The next is—and I think it is right and just—that the community should reap the benefit of the increased values which are due to its own expenditures and its own growth. These two principles appear to me not to be inconsistent, but are a necessary corollary of the doctrine of the rights of property if equitably applied.

PREMIER H. H. ASQUITH.

THE social structure, at whatever time or place, rests on its producing class, as a pyramid rests on its base. Given a base that is weak and continually becoming weaker, it does not require higher mathematics to envisage the downfall of that pyramid. History records no time when the producers, the mass of mankind, were left unmolested in the possession of their products, and history may be read as a chronicle of war and crime and devastation.

OSCAR H. GEIGER.

A CITIZEN has apparently no right to lie down anywhere without paying someone else for permission. All that he can legally do is to tramp along the high road. If he rests on a public bench he is liable to be moved on. But it is not physically possible to be always moving on.

Toronto Telegram.

When We Are Dead

Tell me, when I cross the river
And I find a vacant lot,
Is a landlord standing near it
Who is owner of the plot?
When we strike those open spaces
On which we must pitch our tent,
Must we do so by agreement
To pay Angel Smith the rent?

Angel Smith got there before us,
At which fact he should rejoice,
He thus being fleeter-footed
Has a prior right of choice.
And the lots that he pre-empted
Lie just near the great White Throne—
These the ones he first selected,
These the lots he calls his own.

Tell me, when we cross the river,
Landing at the Jasper Town,
Do we pay in yearly rentals,
Do we buy for so much down?
Do we have to purchase title
From the men who went ahead—
Tell me, is the thing as crazy
Up in Heaven when we're dead?

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

Old Age

As I approach thy dark'ning door, O Death,
I wonder more and more what lies beyond.
Shall I into an endless youth advance,
Or does that shadowy door mean endless death?
Though endless death, why fear to enter in?
Can death be aught than what preceded birth?
But if an endless youth, why fear the joy
Of such a climax to an aged life?

June 14, 1926

LOUIS F. POST

1849—1928

HENRY GEORGE was a visionary, but a very practical visionary. He saw the vision and all his life he made it his, from the time it broke upon him as it did to Saul of Tarsus, as it did to the Hebrew Lawgiver in the thunders of the Mount; it never left him; he lived for—it in a very real sense he died for it. And, that vision he put into "Progress and Poverty" and there it is for generation after generation, ineradicable as the tablets of Moses.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER at the Henry George Congress, Chicago.

FUNDAMENTAL to any programme for the City Beautiful is the land question and ultimately more significant than any petty graft or outrageous salary grab such as Walker has just jammed through or even than the shocking condition of justice in the Magistrates' courts.

—NORMAN THOMAS in the *New Leader*.

The Late T. P. Lyon

HIS VIEWS ON CAPITAL AND INTEREST

I MADE the acquaintance of the late Townsend P. Lyon a day or two after my arrival in Fairhope, when Mr. and Mrs. Lyon called to see me at the Colonial Inn. That was in February, 1920, and from that time onward he and I continued firm friends.

T. P. Lyon was a lover of his kind and in turn troops of friends turned to him with a strong, affectionate impulse. But far beyond the limits of his Fairhope circle his dreaming mind went venturing into those Elysian fields which he sighed for for humanity's sake. He was an honest thinker, and a stubborn adversary when he felt he was right. He was uneasy and disappointed at the small results of fifty years of effort on the part of Single Taxers to impress the public with the importance of their philosophy, fearing that there must be some screw loose in the machinery. He came finally to believe that the appeal of the Single Tax lacked that warm spirit of proselytism which is necessary to win over large numbers. He told me that the cock-sureness of the average Single Taxer seemed to him rather forbidding, especially as he had come to think that criticism of some of their positions was in order.

For instance, he believed with others that their views on the interest question had done the movement great harm, and that the defense of interest was a weak spot in the shining armor of Henry George. George failed to point out the easy exchangeability of saved capital for investments in land, with the resulting family likeness of their offspring, interest and rent. As one knows to a certainty that on the average one can depend on a sure return from an investment in land, one naturally insists on an equal return when he loans out his funds to a solvent borrower. And he gets it without demur. For the paying of interest has grown to be an accepted convention. The huge volume of governmental and corporate indebtedness with its appendage of the interest coupon, offers a safe harbor for investors which is most inviting. There is no doubt that all of us have come to believe that we are entitled to receive interest on loans we make. The question is whether in the long run the smug collector of interest does or does not rob his brother the borrower.

Leaving aside the consideration that with the downfall of private ownership of land general poverty as we know it today will have disappeared and the present necessity for borrowing have been done away with, the question is whether the usual argument that capital by increasing the efficiency of labor is entitled to interest, is valid. Henry George demolished that claim in his well known examination of Bastiat's story of the plane. The fallacy here, according to Mr. George, is that with the loan of the plane is associated the transfer of the increased productive power which a plane gives to labor. "But this is really not involved. The essential thing which James loaned to William is not the increased power which labor acquires from using

planes. To suppose this, we should have to suppose that the making and using of planes was a trade secret or a patent right, when the illustration would become one of monopoly, not of capital. . . . If the power which exists in tools to increase the productiveness of labor were the cause of interest, then the rate of interest would increase with the march of invention. This is not so; nor yet will I be expected to pay more interest if I borrow a fifty dollar sewing machine than if I borrow fifty dollars worth of needles, if I borrow a steam engine than if I borrow a pile of bricks of equal value. Capital, like wealth, is interchangeable. It is not one thing; it is anything to that value within the circle of exchange. Nor yet does the improvement of tools add to the reproductive power of capital; it adds to the productive power of labor."

And on the question of the deterioration of wealth in the form of capital there are, said Henry George, "many forms of capital which will not keep, but must be constantly renewed; and many which are onerous to maintain if one has no immediate use for them. So if the accumulator of capital helps the user of capital by loaning it to him, does not the user discharge the debt in full when he hands it back? Is not the secure preservation, the maintenance, the re-creation of capital, a complete offset to the use?"

I think, said Lyon to me, that the usual definition of capital, viz, "wealth used to produce wealth," is likely to confuse. For more wealth cannot be produced by more wealth, more wealth can only be produced by labor again resorting to and using land. Capital in itself does not produce. A machine may stand still forever unless labor starts it up and keeps it going and in repair, and without the energy of combustion in the coal or oil, labor itself would be powerless. And if capital as we say, increases the efficiency of labor, this means that labor in an age of invention uses finer tools and better machines, which is but equal to saying that labor makes an intenser use of the energy of nature or land.

The result of this procedure necessarily is that both rent and wages tend to increase, whereas nothing supervenes to prevent capital or saved wealth, from its natural tendency to disintegrate, become of inferior value and finally disappear.

Of Henry George's own theory of the origin, inevitability and justness of interest the least said the better. It is transparently fallacious and is the one weak spot in his otherwise brilliant treatise. It is seldom quoted now by his adherents.

The foregoing were the arguments by which our friend sought to justify his opinion on interest, viz that it is a robbery of labor and with the socializing of economic rent it will disappear.

The last year or two of his life were brightened by learning that in distant Western Australia a new school of thinkers has appeared who also insist that interest is a

continuous robbery of labor and that it must be denounced along with the private ownership of land. With these "Liberators" he placed himself in communication, and one of the last acts of his life was to direct that a package of their monthly publication, edited by R. E. White, 2 Lane Street, Perth, Western Australia, be placed in my hands for distribution.

E. YANCEY COHEN in *Fairhope Courier*.

BOOK AND PAMPHLET NOTICES

CATECHISM IN FUNDAMENTAL ECONOMICS

I. D. Beckwith, of Stockton, California, publisher and editor of *The Forum*, has issued a fifty page pamphlet entitled "The Catechism of Fundamental Economics." In the form of questions and answers he surveys the entire field of economics, covering the philosophy and practical application of our doctrine.

So well is this done that it seems doubtful if any need should ever arise for doing the job over again. We do not need to comment upon it further. There are points carefully elaborated which are not usually touched upon in Single Tax discussions. Send for a copy and see for yourself.

TOWARD THE LIGHT

This is the title of a book of nearly three hundred pages published by the Deronda Publishing Company, of this city. The author is Mary Fels, widow of Joseph Fels.

It is the work of a spiritual thinker, and the appeal is to the spirit. Here is a religion of the deeper sort apart from formalism and creed. It is a reminder of the profounder philosophy that is Hebraic in its strain, and in its yearnings toward God it realizes the aspirations of the Hebrew prophets.

It is in the form of readable paragraphs, short sermons they might be called, all instinct with the life of the spirit, but related to morals and conduct. Among what may be called devotional literature it should hold a high place.

Indicating the obstacles that prevent the finer development of men and women she speaks of the work of Joseph Fels for economic emancipation. And reflecting upon conditions as they are, "No wonder," she says, "culture is an extraneous thing—something of the brain, not of the spirit."

Mary Fels has taken us up into the mountains, and it will do us no harm to walk with her a little way.

J. D. M.

LAND TENURE AND UNEMPLOYMENT

The book "Land Tenure and Unemployment" was first published in England in 1925. Frank Geary B. Sd. Econ. of the Inner Temple and the South Eastern Circuit, Barrister-at-Law, is its author, and A. S. Comyns Carr, K. C. writes the preface.

The book states in its opening paragraph: "It is the purpose of this inquiry to discover, if possible, the cause of unemployment, and to indicate the remedy."

With this purpose in mind, the author attempts first of all, to make it quite clear how wealth is produced. He gives as the essential factors, land, which includes all the natural resources of the earth, and labor, and shows how all wealth is the application of labor to land, "adapting, changing or combining natural products to fit them for the satisfaction of human desires by utilizing the reproductive forces of nature and by exchanging the products of labor." . . . "Capital," he says, "is a derivative factor (itself the product of labor and land) and not a primary factor. For this reason capital cannot limit in-

dustry, but only the form of industry, and not even this for long, where there is the opportunity for producing more capital, and security afforded for its growth."

Next he shows that the supply of labor cannot be in excess of the demand so long as human wants are unsatisfied and man has the alternative of "exchanging his labor with someone who can give him the good he wants, or by going directly to the land, producing his own subsistence, and exchanging his surplus for other goods he needs."

This brings us to the point, "that if the supply of labor is not in excess of the demand, and yet there are men who lack the goods they want, the reason must be that the supply of labor is in some way prevented from satisfying demands. . . ." "either that there is insufficient land or that labor is denied access to the land."

From here the inquiry proceeds along historical lines to ascertain whether there is a sufficient area of land to provide opportunities for employment for those who need the results of labor, and if there is, what it is that is preventing the supply of labor from using the land to satisfy its needs.

We find, and the author supports all his claims with a mass of documentary evidence, that in Saxon and early Norman times there was no unemployment in England. "Nature's opportunities for employment were in abundance, and land was freely at the disposal of him who wished to till it." However, soon after the Norman conquest, the Lords began enclosing the waste and common land and from that time throughout the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries, the enclosure movement continued. "In the middle of the 18th century, began the last and greatest period of enclosures, which by the middle of the 19th century had accounted for practically all the land in the kingdom. This period saw the wholesale depopulation and devastation of the countryside; the rise of the slums of the great industrial cities, in which the dispossessed had to take refuge; the pauperization of a large proportion of the population of Great Britain; and the growth of that terrible one-sided competition among the surplus of unemployed for the jobs which appeared to be too few to go around."

In thus appropriating and monopolizing of the land the landlords were, in fact, robbing the community of its rights over land, which originally it clearly possessed and which should have been handed down from generation to generation. These rights were not lost without a struggle. In fact, the Commons of England frequently rose in armed revolt down to the 19th century, when the countryside was so drained that there were few left to rise.

"In Scotland this wholesale confiscation of the rights of the community took place within comparatively recent times, and has turned fertile valleys into desolate wastes and depopulated the whole countryside." Moreover, confiscation is a continuing evil; it does not cease with the generation which commits it.

However, the validity of the author's conclusions do not rest on the origin of rights. Whether the land belongs to the community or to the landlord, his conclusions are based on the fact that when access to land was free to labor and opportunities were available for all, there was no unemployment. Now, with nature's opportunities monopolized, "there is always a large surplus of unemployed, with its complement a mass of underpaid labor."

An investigation of the mineral resources in Great Britain and of land tenure in urban districts, reveals the same state of affairs. Consequently labor, except to a very limited extent, has not been able to avail itself of the advantages of labor-saving machinery. With a surplus of unemployed, the labor-saving inventions only serve to oppress labor further and to throw more men out of jobs.

Capital is often denounced as the cause of unemployment and poverty, but even Karl Marx, the great apostle of this theory, wrote in "Capital" pg. 739, "The starting point of the development that gave rise to the wage-laborer as well as to the capitalist was the servitude of the laborer. . . . The expropriation of the cultural producer or the peasant, from the soil is the basis of the whole process." The capitalist could not have crushed the worker if he had not been driven

off the land and denied the alternative which Nature's resources gave him.

Many support the theory that overpopulation is the cause of unemployment. "If this country contained two men only and one of them owned all the land and had no need of the labor of the other, and refused to even give him permission to use the land, the country would be overpopulated." But in reality, history shows that population seems to increase slowly when wealth is more widely distributed and a rising standard of living is maintained, and that when man is kept down to a condition resembling the lower animals with no future, he, like the animals, multiplies quickly.

Currency manipulation, labor saving-machinery, and trade cycle are other alleged causes of unemployment. The author shows how the exponents of these various so-called causes all err with regard to the same vital point, namely, in entirely disregarding how wealth is really produced and what are the factors necessary for its production.

What is the remedy for the conditions we find prevalent? "The remedy is clear. The land monopoly must be broken down and labor must be afforded free and equal access to all land."

"This might be brought about by a gradual resumption by the community of the rights over land . . . and a change in the basis of taxation and rating, so that . . . industry would be freed from penalizing taxation and the penalty fall on him who withholds land from labor."

"Just as a high protective tariff acts as a wall around a country to keep out a large proportion of foreign goods that in the normal course of trade and exchange would come in, so the land monopoly acts as a tariff protecting the interests of the owners, the monopolist, and keeping out labor.

"This opening up of the land to labor would then have the result of putting an end to the one-sided competition under which workers compete for jobs but employers seldom compete for workers." With Nature's opportunities for employment thrown open to all, the number of potential employers would be greatly increased, and the greatest of all competitors for labor, the demand of labor itself, would have come into the market. Then for the first time for nearly 500 years there would be free competition—a competition which would give to each the full product of his labor, neither more or less."

The research is extensive and detailed, and deals with the subject most convincingly. It should become well known in this country for it is a very valuable addition to "land question" literature.

MABELLE HATHAWAY BROOKS.

CORRESPONDENCE

NEWS FROM RUSSIA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In my letter published in the Sept.-Oct. number of LAND AND FREEDOM the statement is made that the Russian Government in carrying out its plan for internal improvements had negotiated no loans either foreign or domestic. This was true at the time the letter was written, but later a ruling was made that a deduction of about 8% would be made from the monthly salaries of all persons employed on government work, and when the deductions amounted to 100 rubles a bond would be given for the amount. These bonds draw interest and are negotiable at the government banks.

In the letter it was intimated that but little Sunday work was done in Russia. This was true also when the letter was written, but a ruling or law has gone into effect giving all workers a holiday every fifth day. Work continues without interruption and one fifth of the workers every day are having a holiday. This arrangement is causing very general dissatisfaction. The full benefits of a holiday can not be secured without the mass of the people having their holiday at the same time, as is the case in regard to the national holidays.

Alma Ata, Kazakstan.

W. A. WARREN.

HOW HERBERT BIGELOW WAS CONVERTED

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The short note in your recent issue telling of the death of George Von Auer recalls the fact that to him the movement is indebted for Herbert S. Bigelow and, no doubt, for others. It was in 1897 that Von Auer, at that time a new comer in Cincinnati, discovered a young preacher more interested in discussing economic conditions than in holding his job. He promptly joined his church and took upon himself the task of straightening the kinks in Bigelow's arguments. That he made progress in this job is a fact, although the credit for the finishing touch in Bigelow's conversion belongs to James R. Brown. It was Von Auer also who rounded up the Single Taxers of Cincinnati into allying themselves with Bigelow's church and helping in wresting it from control of the reactionaries. The influence which that institution under Bigelow's guidance has had in both local and state affairs, and the help that it was to Tom L. Johnson, are matters of history. Let it be remembered that George Von Auer planted the seed from which this grew.

Baltimore, Md.

SAMUEL DANZIGER.

COMMENDATION FROM CANADA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

If one wants to get the truth, unadulterated, it can be found in LAND AND FREEDOM. It looks as though in our Western Civilization, especially on this continent, as if, as Henry George so truly portrays in "Progress and Poverty," "the Pillars of the Republic are already tottering to their fall" and due to Land Monopoly we have "beggars on our streets and tramps on our roads," and in high places sit those who do not pay to civic virtue even the compliment of hypocrisy. I am pleased to see that your publication is still upholding the torchlight of freedom, and if the masses do not, through excess of poverty, become too debased and degraded to care what happens, the silver lining may yet appear out of the dark clouds which are trying to engulf us all. Toronto, Canada.

WM. R. WILLIAMS.

FINDS THE EDITOR NODDING

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Helmut Schulz, of Brooklyn High School, is to be congratulated on his prize-winning essay, "Economic Principles as Expounded by Henry George in "Progress and Poverty." It is encouraging, indeed to find a high school pupil with so keen an insight into economic principles, and the ability to express them so lucidly.

An apparent contradiction has crept into the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. At the conclusion of Mr. Schulz's essay there is a reference to New South Wales as a country in which Single Tax principles are being tried out, and the paragraph ends with the following statement: "Although only a young nation it boasts such wealth and general prosperity as bespeak the benefits of an equitable economic distribution."

The article "Australia in Extremis" on page 15 of the above issue gives an entirely different picture of conditions in New South Wales. It states, for example, that there are 30,000 unemployed in New South Wales alone. The situation is fully explained to those who care to read through the article carefully, but it is such apparent contradictions that our opponents are quick to take advantage of.

The writer has been much interested in the discussions on co-operation between Single Taxers and Socialists in political campaigns. Both groups having the same object, it does seem as if they could unite on some common interest, and the question has often come up in the past, but the inherently diametrically opposite viewpoints make such cooperation difficult.

For example, in his speech here in Milwaukee last Friday night Mr. Norman Thomas set forth as his remedies for social evils the following: public ownership of big business, unemployment insurance, public

employment exchanges, work on public projects to take up slack employment periods in industry, the five-day week and "heavier inheritance and income tax."

There is little encouragement for a Single Taxer in that statement and he would be hard put to it to defend the economic principles of such a candidate and still maintain his position as a follower of Henry George.

Milwaukee, Wisc.

K. L. HANSEN.

FROM A VETERAN WHOM WE HONOR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I want to thank you most sincerely for your kind notice of my 90th birthday.

With inspiration and strength to go on in my work in promoting the Georgan philosophy, my faithful wife can write my thoughts and my conclusions. I have received beautiful congratulations from Hon. Chas. O'Connor Hennessy, Mary Fels, Alice Thacher Post, Judge Blackman and every one of the clerks and officers of the Supreme Court in Brooklyn. I am rich in my faithful friends including yourself.

May the Creator of the universe bless you and every one of these named with long life and continued service. I am sincerely grateful.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

EBEN STILLMAN DOUBLEDAY.

SOME SORT OF UNITY SEEMS POSSIBLE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The progressive politico-economic movement in this country has reached a stage where it would seem to be a tactical error if Georgists stand aloof. The Socialists, under the leadership of such scholars as Thomas and Laidler, are becoming increasingly less doctrinaire. They are now meeting us Single Taxers half way by incorporating our ideas into a modified socialism. Henry George had no objections to socialistic reforms, but merely insisted that other reforms, by making the earth a more desirable habitation, enabled landlords to charge us correspondingly more for the privilege of enjoying the then more desirable habitation. Economic rents, lost to landlords, will be higher in a state where there are such things as the construction of public works to relieve business depression, public ownership of natural bounties and of public service industries, free trade, cooperatives, old age pensions, unemployment insurance, and freedom from the danger of industrial strife and of foreign war.

The adoption of these reforms, first, might perhaps place in relief, and show up the more plainly, the then exaggerated evil of landlordism, thus being educational, although needlessly expensive. But these reforms do not need to precede ours, because we may be able to have the cooperation of large groups which are willing, right now, to go along with us on the economic rent question if we will go along with them on their pet questions. "Labor" would appreciate more general support and would probably reciprocate. It would probably be more willing and able to change its brutal tactics when, and if, it saw that, by so doing, it would gain such additional support in its disheartening fight for a normal wage and even for the mere right to produce the necessities of life. Many reform movements would take heart and exert greater efforts, if there was a political party they could call their own, and if they had reasonable assurance that their votes would become effective in the not too remote future.

The League for Independent Political Action, now forming, advocates among other reforms, public ownership of coal mines and of the electric power industry, taxation of land values and free trade. A spokesman for the League says that there should be skimmed off through taxes on large incomes, inheritances and economic rent, those socially appropriable surpluses which are not necessary to carry on production, but which are, instead, merely tolls levied because of a monopolistic position. These words are as much Georgist as they are Socialist. If we Georgists have overestimated and other groups have underestimated the importance of our theory, they and we now have

a chance to learn as we go along together adopting one or another reform.

The Socialists will undoubtedly cooperate with the League but may retain their own identity and organization. In a national election, and in elections in smaller political subdivisions where there is little chance for a Socialist candidate, they will vote for the candidate of the new party. Likewise, the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota might vote the new party ticket in a national election only, or it might identify itself with the new party. The new party would not try to duplicate the Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota nor would it try to duplicate the Socialist Party in Milwaukee or Reading. Georgists, may retain their identity and organizations and carry on as always, but in addition would have the satisfaction of voting for a party pledged to free trade and taxation of land values.

Last, but not least, here is a chance for Single Taxers, and Socialists as well, to undo the public's suspicion of, and prejudice against, the single track mind. As Norman Thomas says, let us take the attitude of path-finders and not that of a Messiah.

The leadership of John Dewey should induce Georgists to join the League and do it now.

Chicago, Ill.

WALTER VERITY.

"UNEARNED INCREMENTS"

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In regard to the recent discussion in your paper as to the desirability of working with the Socialists to attain common ends, I think such a course of action is highly desirable. As I understand the situation, Single Taxers and Socialists both desire that unearned increments in land values be appropriated by the public. The Single Taxers think this will cure most of the ills of society. The Socialists agree that it will cure many of such ills, but contend that there are other unearned increments that should be appropriated as well. As it is manifestly impossible to cure all the ills of society at one stroke, and whatever reforms are effected will have to be effected gradually and by piecemeal, it seems to me that the appropriation of the unearned increment of land will come first, as it is so much more easily effected and will not have the opposition that the whole programme of the Socialists will have. When that reform is achieved by the help of the Socialists, the Single Taxers will then use their judgment whether to go along with the Socialists in order to capture other unearned increments, or to rest content with their achievements and part company with the Socialists in their future operations. It is my belief that when that time comes, conditions will be so much improved and people will see the benefits of taking for the community what belongs to it that Single Taxers together with the Socialists will insist that all unearned increments of whatever nature go to those to whom they of right belong, but whether they do or not, let us work together as much and as long as we possibly can.

Seattle, Wash.

A. M. MOREY.

IS THERE A REAL DANGER HERE?

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Permit me to say a word anent the current discussion in your columns of the relations between Socialists and Single Taxers.

The Socialists would destroy private property rights in land as a first step toward destroying all private property rights; the Single Taxer would destroy private property rights in land as a first step toward conserving private property rights, recognizing that to extend private property rights to the inclusion of land is to deny true property rights, because equal right of access is thus denied to that from which all property must be produced.

The Methodist asked the Quaker for a contribution toward tearing down the Church steeple and replacing it with a higher one; the Quaker replied that Quakers did not believe in Church steeples, but that he would contribute \$5 toward demolishing the present one, hop-

ing that this first step would exhaust the fund available and that the Church would thus be left steepleless. The Bootlegger and the Dry both vote for Prohibition,—the first because he thinks it will bring him more profitable opportunities for selling liquor, the other because he believes the law will stop liquor dealing.

Can the Methodist and the Quaker, the Bootlegger and the Dry, be properly regarded as "cooperating," or is it merely incidental that for the time being they are just doing the same thing?

Truly, there is merit in the thought suggested by Mr. Geiger, that while the Methodist and the Quaker are together demolishing the old church steeple, one may convert the other as to the desirability or undesirability of replacing it with another,—but which will be which? It is obvious that a very large percentage of those who rank as "Single Taxers" are such chiefly from sentiment; they do not clearly comprehend economic principles, and would flop either way, with the crowd. Is there a real danger here?

Towaco, N. J.

GEORGE L. RUSBY.

MAJOR MILLER FOR SUPPORT OF NORMAN THOMAS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

My experience of over forty years leads me to the belief that our progress will necessarily be very slow if we vote only for those who are completely and exclusively devoted to the Single Tax pure and simple.

While it is true enough that Socialism is, by its nature, contrary to the Single Tax, yet it seems to me that when a Socialist candidate such as Norman Thomas clearly endorses what would be an important step in our direction, we should support him.

All political platforms are more or less compromises, and it would be always our privilege if not our duty to state the grounds upon which our support is based and our reasons for not endorsing other planks in the candidate's platform.

There are no arch-angels available as candidates for public office and we must take them as we find them and make the best of them.

Lake Worth, Florida

FRED J. MILLER.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

JOHN A. ZANGERLE, assessor of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, asked by a Cleveland newspaper to reply to a Cleveland landowner who had complained of the assessment of his land for taxation, did so in detail, and his last paragraph must have been a shock to the real estate board:

"I note that the complainant urges that Euclid Avenue development is being delayed by high taxes on land value. This is news to me. I always had assumed that a high tax on land value stimulated improvement of the land, and that low taxes delayed its improvement. On the other hand, I always understood a corollary to be that a high tax on improvements delayed the improvements but that a low tax on the improvements stimulated their development."

IN Bengal, India, although land values have enormously increased, the government's revenue from landowners remains exactly the same as fixed by Lord Cornwallis a century and a quarter ago, and that's what the land speculators would like to do here.

PRAGUE does not give housing subsidies, but has exempted buildings from taxation until 1935, and the old city is building up rapidly, furnishing better shelter and much employment.

MANCHESTER, ENGLAND, to give employment to 450 idle men, paid \$885,000 for idle land, or \$1,300 per man.

WE have had frequent occasion to speak in terms of high praise of the excellence of our contemporary, *The Standard*, of Sydney, N. S. Wales. There is no Single Tax paper in the English speaking world that excels it in vigor, wit and clarity. Those political time-servers

in and out of power must writhe under the rapier thrusts of this experienced and brilliant journalist. We urge our readers to get this paper which is published at 114 Hunter Street, Sydney, Australia.

S. S. TABER writes us from San Diego, California: "If you can assist in making it clear to the man in the street that the general property tax is simply a method of transferring wealth you would confer a favor that would be appreciated."

HON. EDWARD POLAK, of this city, writes: "Jan.-Feb. number of LAND AND FREEDOM will be enjoyed by all Single Taxers who read it."

IN *Commerce and Finance* of this city Mr. M'Cready Sykes propounds certain questions and answers them. One is as follows:

"What is the best way to stop the present crime wave?"

There is no crime wave. The improvement of the economic system should lessen poverty and ignorance, which are the chief causes of crime."

Mr. Sykes is a nephew of T. I. M'Cready, long ago an editorial writer on Henry George's *Standard*.

THE recent death of Jokachi Takamine, Jr., by a fall from the window of his room at the Roosevelt Hotel in this city, is reported in the newspapers. Young Mr. Takamine was the son of Dr. Jokachi Takamine, famous Japanese chemist, Single Taxer and friend of the George family.

THE *Standard*, of Sydney, Australia, tells of the death of C. L. Garland, one of the pioneers of the Single Tax movement. Mr. Garland visited America to induce Henry George to undertake his Australian trip. He helped to arrange the initial meeting at Protestant Hall in Sydney, the largest meeting place at that day in the city. The late Sir George Reid (at that time plain Mr. Reid) consented to preside at what proved a great and notable occasion.

A LIFE of General Lafayette, by Brand Whitlock, has just been published.

A FOUR-PAGE leaflet addressed to workingmen by Thos. Colgate has been published by the Henry George Foundation.

Stimuli, which is published by F. Lincoln Hutchins, at Baltimore, Md., has attained its fifteenth number. It appears monthly. Samuel Danziger writes informally in every issue on current problems.

THE *Square Deal*, of Toronto, announces the formation of a Henry George Foundation for Canada, fuller particulars of which are to follow.

E. J. CRAIGIE is the Single Tax candidate for representative in the Flinders district of Adelaide, South Australia. There is no one better qualified than Mr. Craigie to carry forward the banner of industrial emancipation. He is held in high esteem by his fellow co-workers.

OLIN J. ROSE, a distinguished Columbus, O., attorney, is having a letter-writing contest in the *Ohio State Journal* with a Communist; but, as he accepts the Communist's idea that land and all forms of legalized monopoly are properly included in the term Capital, he does not get very far.

GEORGE S. MYERS, of 1844 Wymore Avenue, East Cleveland, O., wants a national unemployment commission appointed by the government "of such a high character and chosen in such a manner that its findings perforce would command universal respect." He adds: "Once having obtained a full, complete and fair report of the entire problem, the next logical step would be to find the proper remedy. That remedy

would have to avoid the evils of socialism and paternalism. America is and ever will be committed to the principle of private right of property and a full reward for every man's endeavor."

FRANK H. HOWE, of Columbus, O., had a letter in the *Ohio State Journal*, replying to a correspondent who wrote that "the problem of unemployment is still unsolved." Howe quotes from "Progress and Poverty" liberally.

IN a lecture on "The Workingman," Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, said that the workingman "enjoys today a higher standard of living, better conditions of employment, shorter hours, higher wages than at any time since the beginning of time," and then spoiled the glowing picture by saying, near the end of his talk, that "two-thirds of American families fall short of the minimum budget requisite for a decent standard of living, millions live on the verge of want, and contingencies frequently force many of them below the line of want." The rabbi was apparently unconscious of this glaring contradiction of himself, and he is probably the most popular pulpit orator in Ohio. He is giving a series of lectures on "Men Who Serve," but would be more interesting if he lectured on "Men Who Do Not Serve."

PETER WITT, of Cleveland, has been making a number of tariff speeches. Three persons who heard him called him by phone to ask questions. This encouraged him to write an article which was published March 1 as an interview. He called the tariff "an international swindle." "Governments like it," he said, "because it is an indirect tax and gets the most feathers from the goose with the least squawking. People accept it because they are told it is true. No one can think about it and believe it."

STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Cleveland, who used to belong to a Single Tax club but has never been active in the movement, has announced himself as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for governor of Ohio.

"No one church can successfully minister to all, but all can work together in great social cause, and will need to, if the great problems of poverty and war are to be solved."—says Rev. Earl H. Thayer, of the First Congregational Church, Cleveland, O.

THE Cuyahoga County, Ohio, Young People's Council, representing protestant churches, held its fourth annual conference, Feb. 2, 700 young people meeting in eighteen discussion groups. Each group, at the close of its session, sent a delegate to meet Rev. George M. Gibson, Jr., of Trinity Congregational Church, to give the gist of the findings of their respective groups. It was agreed that worship is "valueless if it does not reach its fruition in righteous social action and improved social relations." Dr. Gibson, in summarizing the discussions, said the church must "blaze new trails, seek new truths, and aid people in adapting themselves to new situations." He urges youth to do their own thinking in seeking religious truth, and these 700 in Cuyahoga are evidently doing it, according to the long and interesting report of the Council's session given by Guy Clemmitt, religious editor of the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*.

E. W. DORY, famous in Cleveland for his wit, was selected by the Cleveland Real Estate Board to preside as toastmaster at their recent annual banquet, although they know him for an ardent Single Taxer.

RALPH G. HESS, real estate editor of the *Cleveland News*, reports Louis Brandt, housing engineer, Pittsburgh, as saying in a speech before the Home Owner's Bureau of Cleveland, that "Loaning Institu-

ions know the uncertainties of values in improvements and overpriced building sites," and that "The time is rapidly coming when lot-selling merely as a speculation will come to an end."

A BILL has been introduced in the New Jersey legislature by Assemblyman Joseph Thompson which will permit any municipality in the state to adopt the so-called Pittsburgh Plan of a half rate tax on improvements. Another bill introduced by the same Assemblyman provides for a gradual repeal of taxes on buildings and tangible personal property.

THE millionaire income class has been increased over two hundred in the United States. What a prosperous people we are!

S. I. CASTO in the Portland, Oregon, *Journal*, writes clearly and admirably on poverty and the cause of crime.

"THE tariff problem used to worry me," writes John W. Love, *Cleveland Plain Dealer* columnist. "Then I realized that, if things improved, my rent would go up, but if they get worse, it would go down; life's sublime equilibrium would be maintained."

CLEVELAND'S ASSOCIATED CHARITIES has solved the unemployment problem for a few people by paying them to "survey" the street beggars.

JOHN W. ROFER, columnist of the *Cleveland Press*, says:

"You may not be able to decide with whom you'd rather spend a year on an island, a dozen Communists, or a dozen councilmen," postcards H. C., "but I find it no puzzle. I prefer the Communist to the councilmen, for I don't believe the Communist would combine to unload any real estate on me."

REGARDING the suggestion of some sort of cooperation between Single Taxers and Socialists, J. R. Hermann, who is skeptical and has a sense of humor, offers the following proposition:

"Let us have a baseball game, with the extreme Socialists on one side and the inch at a time stepping Single Taxers on the other side, with Norman Thomas as pitcher and Edward White as referee, and let the gate receipts be sent to the Oregon campaign."

FRANK G. ANDERSON, of Jamestown, N. Y., has contributed during the past few months several Single Tax letters to the Swedish-American press in different parts of the country.

"CAN President Hoover Assure Equitable Prosperity," is the title of a twenty page pamphlet written and published by our friend, S. S. Taber, of San Diego, California.

FEW of our readers know that the Hon. William N. McNair, now on the lecture staff of the Henry George Association in Chicago, 538 South Dearborn Street, increased the Democratic vote in 1921 for mayor of Philadelphia from 5,000 to over 40,000 and as the candidate for U. S. Senator of Pennsylvania increased the Democratic vote from 400,000 to over 1,000,000, running ahead of Al Smith by several thousand.

"A LOVER of Dr. McGlynn" reviews the McGlynn case, which stirred the entire world in the late eighties, in a recent issue of the *Irish Weekly*, of Belfast, Ireland.

THE Ingram Institute, of San Diego, under the management of F. F. Ingram, formerly of Detroit, has begun operations and is publishing a little paper entitled the *Ingram Institute News*, for the purpose

of placing before the public and legislative bodies the findings and recommendations of the Institute. Assisting Mr. Ingram in his educational programme are John M. Henry, formerly of Pittsburgh, James MacGregor, J. H. Rainwater and others. The March number of the *Institute News* contains an address delivered by Mr. MacGregor on "Labor's Opportunity."

THE N. Y. *World* of Feb. 27, contained a sketch of the life and work of David Gibson, former editor of the well remembered *Ground Hog* and now editor and publisher of the *Lorain Journal*, of Lorain, Ohio. The heading to this article on this familiar figure in the movement is entitled, Cleveland Editor Single Tax Leader. It recounts his singular facility in the creation of striking epigrams, with which most of us are familiar. We had a taste of his quality in the fine address he made at the Henry George Congress in Pittsburgh last September.

J. F. COLBERT, speaking before the Louisiana Association of Assessors, said that there would be more homes if all taxation were levied upon land values. Mr. Colbert is, as our readers know, a member of the Louisiana State Tax Commission.

THE Wilmington (Del.) *Morning News* contained an editorial on the celebration of the seventieth birthday of Frank Stephens at Arden, and says "he richly deserves the tribute paid him."

THE death of E. N. Vallandigham, in Seville, Spain, where he was journeying, removes another old friend of the Georgist cause. He was an intimate friend of Henry George, Jr., Louis F. Post and others. For Mr. Post's work "What is the Single Tax?" published by the Vanguard Press of this city, he wrote the admirable Introduction. He had much communication in recent years with Charles O'Connor Hennessy, for he was an ardent supporter of the International Union. He graduated from the University of Delaware at the age of sixteen, and was later Professor of English at the same institution. He began his newspaper work on the *Philadelphia Times* and was later editorial writer on the *Philadelphia Record*, the *Boston Herald* and the old *Sun* of New York City, and a contributor of special articles to the old *Tribune* of this city. He wrote for Henry George's *Standard* and favored LAND AND FREEDOM and the *Single Tax Review* with several contributions. He was seventy-six years old. In another column of this issue will be found an editorial tribute to this distinguished disciple of Henry George from the *Boston Herald*.

OTHERS deaths which have occurred in recent months are those of Ambrose A. Worsley, of Chicago at the age of sixty-three; J. H. Sheets, of Loma, North Dakota; George Hebard, of Hollywood, California. Mr. Worsley was a close friend of William Jennings Bryan, and for years a leading spirit in the Chicago Single Tax Club.

DEATH has taken its toll of Single Taxers in Chicago in recent months. To the names already given must be added that of Theodore J. Amberg, dead at the age of seventy-four. Mr. Amberg was long a subscriber to this paper, indeed almost from the beginning. He is survived by a widow and six sons. He was prominent in the business world of Chicago, being president of the Amberg File and Index company.

OUR readers will learn with pleasure of the marriage of John Lawrence Monroe, son of the late Frederick H. Monroe, of the Henry George Lecture Association, to Miss Marien Tideman, of Chicago. Many of our readers will remember both of the young people at Chicago and Pittsburgh and will wish them long life and happiness and a career of great usefulness to the cause which has enlisted their activities, for both will continue the work for the advancement of the principles of Henry George. Marien is a member of the Tideman family which numbers many devoted disciples of our cause.