May-June, 1932

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

# Outwitting Communism—Radio Broadcast Franklin Wentworth

As to Interest E. Wye

Reply to E. Wye Oscar H. Geiger

The Coming
Henry George Congress at Memphis

News of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, the Henry George School of Social Science, the Henry George Lecture Association, the Manhattan Single Tax Club, Book Reviews, Correspondence, etc.

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 Street, N. Y. City GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

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

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

### MAY-JUNE, 1932

Vol. XXXII

No. 3, Whole No. 172

#### 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. Centenario 219, San Luis Potosi City, Mexico

#### INDEX TO CONTENTS

P	AGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION	75
OUTWITTING COMMUNISM (RADIO BROADCAST)	
Franklin Wentworth	78
A PLEA IN AVOIDANCEEditor	82
FOR CONGRESSMEN TO READ	83
AS TO INTEREST	85
REPLY TO E. WYEOscar H. Geiger	89
HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE	94
MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB ACTIVITIES	95
THE HENRY GEORGE LECTURE ASSOCIATION	97
SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION WORK	100
MEMPHIS WILL HAVE CONVENTION	101
A SINGLE TAXER ANSWERSOscar H. Geiger	101
PROGRESS AND POVERTYBen Hardy, Jr.	102
BOOK REVIEWS	104
CORRESPONDENCE	105
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS	107

# WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

'aking 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. XXXII

MAY-JUNE, 1932

No. 3

# Comment and Reflection

66 TT is a sad reflection that this land should have come to such a pass that willing hands are idle; but alas! the worst is not yet. As machinery advances to greater perfection there must, of necessity, come about a state of affairs where fewer and fewer workers are needed to produce more wealth, or goods. And as women invade industry there must come about a lowering of wages as well as fewer places for men. The balance of increased wealth must needs find its way into the hands of a few favored individuals, so, as anyone may see, the general tendency is toward more unemployment until the world wakes up to the sad truth. For help we cannot look to professional politicians. In them is no hope. So long as their physical comfort is untouched they will not stir a hand. With them the interests of capital are primary; of men, entirely secondary. Our political problems, as you see, hinge on money problems alone and we have lost sight of men and their needs.'

THUS Charles J. Finger in his All's Well, an interesting magazine he edits. As Mr. Finger is reputed to be a Single Taxer, on some evidence not yet produced, it is well to put this before our readers as relieving him of any such suspicion.

No machine ever threw any man out of employment. Every machine feeds other machines and starts the wheels going in many directions. The tendency of machines is to raise wages; to increase purchasing power by lowering tost of production; to stimulate inventive ability and widen its field of usefulness to humanity; to multiply the number of products, putting more and more wealth within asier reach of the masses of the people. The consumer inds his effective demand increased by reduction in price. What is saved from his purchases goes to make further lemands on the higher-priced products of labor and raises the standard of living.

F the printing business Mr. Finger knows something. Did the linotype throw any printers out of employment? Did the locomotive, chief among modern inventions, decrease the demand for labor? Or the automobile? Was it a dreadful thing when the sewing machine replaced the hand needle? In the hand-needle age was the condition of the sewing woman so enviable? Not if we accept the undoubtedly true picture of conditions among this type of workers versed by Thomas Hood in "The Song of the Shirt."

M. FINGER is the true descendant of those who rioted in Lancashire when Arkwright introduced his spinning jenny. For even if he is law-abiding and would not riot, his thinking, and that of men who think as he does, is the same as that of those who rose against the machine in the cotton-goods manufacturing districts of England during the last century.

WHAT is it that so deceives men who talk of the "machine age"? Undoubtedly it lies in appearances. If a machine is invented that does the work of two men where one sufficed before, is it not obvious that one man is thrown out of employment? Superficial observers might think that way, but not the reflecting men. For as this process has been going on for several centuries, it should be obvious that most of us would have been out of employment before this depression set in—not ten millions in this country but nearer forty millions idle!

HAT deceives Mr. Finger is not that machines seem to be throwing men out of employment, but that behind this unreal appearance something else goes on which many have not the wit to see. For as machines turn out their products the gain is absorbed by the earth-owners in increased rent. Little is left after rent is abstracted from the total wealth produced, and nothing or little remains to labor to buy back its products. This causes the phenomenon which short-sighted economists call "overproduction." Rent is the "machine" that works relentlessly, undoing the natural processes of distribution.

THERE is no more limit to the production of machines than there is to any other labor product. They all come from the earth. And this is true of the larger as well as the smaller machines. A machine is not a self-created, greedily consuming automaton! Labor is needed both to create and maintain it. Normally and naturally it places vastly increased satisfactions within the reach of the masses.

In a society where wealth is concentrated, machines as well as other products of labor tend to ownership in fewer and fewer hands. Denied the power to freely produce machines, or any other form of wealth, labor finds that the owner of the machine, as well as the owner of other forms of capital, commands the service of labor

almost at his own price. What curious perversion of reasoning it is that turns from the real enemy of labor to attack with angry epithet the machine which is its servant!

THE machine is not a Frankenstein that labor creates that it may be devoured. It is the hands and arms and visible brain of labor. It is not necessary for government to assume ownership and control to secure the widespread diffusion of its benefits. Under free conditions where gains from the machines are not absorbed by the insatiate growth of land values—economic rent—the tremendous increase in production calls for commensurate exchange of other products made by other machines, each in turn. How, Mr. Finger, can anything produced by labor, which can be multiplied infinitely, injure the interest of the producer? A machine, as has been said, is a labor product. How can a labor product hold a menace for the man who creates it?

WE fancy the reply will be that some machines require large sums of money to produce them, and that labor has at its command no such amounts of capital. If this is the thought, let the objector reflect on the natural law of cooperation. As labor is the producer of all capital—the wealth that is used in the making of more wealth—it is clear that with natural resources free to labor, machines would soon be generally owned, not under government supervision but under the operation of natural laws of production and distribution. It should be remembered that we are living today under artificial restrictions in which opportunities for employment are almost entirely restricted. It was assumed that Mr. Finger knew this.

WITH a Free Earth, with every restriction to the use of natural resources swept away, capital would soon change owners under the rapid differences that would appear. For those who under present conditions control the natural resources of the earth must control the capital. Capital not based upon earth ownership, or equivalent monopoly, is at a marked disadvantage. This is what deceives the Socialist. He is misled by appearances. He has forgotten his Karl Marx, who told us in his "Das Kapital" that the ownership of natural resources was at the basis of the exploitation of labor. His mistake is the same as that of Mr. Finger, who thinks, rather preposterously, that labor can fashion anything in the shape of a labor product for his own destruction.

THIS needs to be considered by Mr. Finger and those who think with him. Machinery and invention, even under present conditions, offer boundless opportunities for labor. But Rent, actual and anticipatory, moves fast, though not always fast enough to absorb all the gains of Wages and Interest to real capital. Usually a step in advance, Rent at other times may lag a little behind. If

the gain from a machine is 3, rent quickly takes 2, and eventually the whole. Then follows the break in "effective demand," labor cannot buy back its product, and the machine, which is labor's hands and arms, stands idle along with the idle laborer. For a short time it seems to the superficial observer that the capital in control of the machine has profited inordinately, but a closer observation shows rent rising ever higher, absorbing the gains of capital and leaving to the "employer" of labor a lot of rusting iron!

THE New York Times is a staid newspaper, staid almost to the point of solemnity. Yet if one having no knowledge of fundamentals rushes in to discuss the prevailing depression and remedies therefor, he is almost bound to be funny in a solemn way. H. L. Puxley is one of its financial writers. He is not yet sufficiently well known to have his name go thundering down the ages, or even as far as the back street. But he has great resourcefulness that may yet win him fame. He suggests as a means o bettering conditions a national raffle in which every citizer is to be given a free ticket, and in which prizes to the amoun of \$250,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes would be issued to those holding the lucky numbers! And this is urged i all seriousness.

MR. PUXLEY makes other suggestions which he naively admits are "highly controversial" and require to be "argued out," but are here advanced for consideration rather than "dogmatic demands for action." For this we should be grateful. A Grand National Sweet stakes to End Depression would add to the joy of national A picture arises in our mind of Mr. Hoover blindfolde—for we would trust no less responsible an individual-drawing the winning tickets from their receptacle! Conmenting once more on the rather original suggestion of Mr. Puxley, we want to instance it as one among the man examples of what we have termed "the breaking dow of the contemporary mind."

SPEAKING of cures for the depression not long ag Rudy Vallee paid a visit to President Hoover. The President, probably remembering the old saying of son great man—was it Fletcher of Saltoun?—that "he can not who made the laws of a country if he were permitte to write its songs," asked Rudy if he could write a son that would dispel the present depression. A friend ours, having in mind the simplicity of Mr. Hoover's cha acter, insists that our worthy President said this in seriousness. But we are skeptical.

WE are not convinced that the philosophy of Spino offers a complete explanation of the phenomena being, but it is the nearest to perfection in its endeavor answer ever attempted by the mind of man. Setti

side his system of pantheism (or perhaps even adopting part of that philosophy), his ethics is as lofty as that of ny teaching, past or present. It has been the impression f scholars that a certain affinity was not lacking between he teachings of Henry George and Spinoza, and if we onsider the ethical teaching of both we shall find that this indeed so. And there is also something in the characters f both men that suggests a moral likeness. "The very est man these modern times have seen," said a reviewer is the early part of the last century, who was by no means disciple of the philosopher.

THIS allusion to Spinoza finds its suggestion in a magazine that has come to our desk, the title of which is pinoza in America. We quote a few significant pararaphs:

Today, everybody is talking about the depression in the world, at not everybody is interested in its underlying causes. To be terested in the causes means to study and understand human nature st. This standard will make it easier to view the economic-political roblems in a clear light. By understanding ourselves and other aman beings, we shall be able to solve these difficult problems. Yes, at where can we learn what mutual understanding is? Do we not sed institutions for such a purpose? \* \* \* We need schools where udents can be taught to think nobly. Noble thinking alone helps solve the individual, the national and the world problems in the ght of truth. \* \* \*

For example, how can we solve the problem of distribution of goods thout having a true idea of goodness and cooperation in our minds? ow can we cooperate without the ethical willingness to sacrifice for e sake of others? Would there be room for a depression in a country aich is governed by men with unselfish ends?

HERE follows a complaint that schools and colleges have failed us, that there is need of an institution to delop "the art of thinking." And the disciples of Spinoza America have started just such an institution. We comend their action and wish them success. And we bring their attention the Henry George School of Social tience. The same animating motive is behind this hool that has led our friends to call for the establishment an institution to popularize and extend the teachings Spinoza. And we find, too, that the objects of both oups are in some degree curiously identical.

TENRY GEORGE was a strange and significant phenomenon in the midst of an age of acquisitiveness and aterialism. He sought and found fundamentalm orales as the basis of an economic philosophy, and nobody ho has read 'Progress and Poverty' is ever the same his thinking as he was before he saw those eloquent and pressive pages. Much that Mr. George taught has now come a part of the every-day philosophy of our political e, and much more will become a part of it. I do not, wever, believe there will be any sudden application of r. George's principles. Sound political development is matter of growth and not a matter of revolution, and en a fundamentally right economic doctrine, if it indives a radical departure from accepted practices, has to

be absorbed little by little to avoid consequences too severe to endure which would follow a nation-wide attempt to go back to the beginnings of things to correct an ancient error."

THE foregoing is from a possible candidate for the Presidency, a man of high ideals which have guided him in a distinguished public career. It calls for something more than casual comment, for it is unquestionably an animating conviction with many who seek political preferment and take counsel of caution in the path they are treading, holding their convictions, so to speak, in leash for fear of possible consequences to themselves. As this letter involves an attitude not uncommon among public men, we pause to examine all its implications.

INSTITUTIONS must be subjected continuously to the test of service. Are they outgrown? It is not enough that they may have served past needs. Institutions must be changed as life itself changes. When institutions are outgrown and live only by the strength given them through tradition they are obstacles on the way to progress. The essential demands of an advancing civilization call for their modification or destruction. Answering perhaps the needs of former life on this earth, they have ceased to respond to present needs.

Now whether this destruction or modification shall be effected immediately or not depends upon a variety of circumstances. The easiest way to get rid of them may be by one blow. Or it may be more completely eliminated by gradual processes of modification. As to the shock following upon its instant rectification we are not greatly concerned. For we are impelled to ask, What of the shock to ten millions of our people in the loss of employment, the failures and bankruptcies of business concerns, and the crashing of nine thousand banks in nine years? If such shocks can be avoided, as we know they can be, we may regard with small apprehension the shock that will follow the immediate setting of the house in order, even if some of the old furniture is lost.

WITH civilization on the verge of collapse it is idle for us to voice counsels of caution. The writer of the foregoing quoted paragraph knows full well what Henry George's remedy will do to make forever impossible the terrible times through which we are passing. Yet he fears the shock that will follow any immediate attempt to rectify a great wrong, to restore the natural order, to free natural resources. This would be a "shock," it is true, some disarrangement at first, some losses, and some difficulties in the reorganization of the new society. But it would be worth the price. Maybe even the difficulties of the shock can be avoided. It is no real service that any reformer renders to a great cause by emphasizing

that it may be brought about gradually. It may be that the great change we advocate should come about suddenly lest a worse thing befall us.

WHY will men be so timorous of achieving the great and true through travail and trouble? Why should they shrink from the minor difficulties in effecting a change in conditions that will restore the balance of the world? We are talking now to a man who knows, and we do not have to lecture. He knows all this as well as any reader of LAND AND FREEDOM. Besides, he is a man of vision with an outlook on the world that transcends the ordinary man's gift of seeing. How with such mental and spiritual equipment can he think as he does?

If the change we advocate is rejected, there are two ways open in the path that must be trod by civilization—revolution or chaos. If apathy and social prejudice now make difficult or impossible the necessary change; if outgrown institutions enlist in their support the influence of the learned and powerful, the sanction of organized religion, and the voice of a subsidized press, it is not more than has happened to protect, defend and favor every hoary superstition which the demands for a fuller life have sought to overthrow.

# The Land Question in India

In several districts of Bombay, too, where an intensive political campaign has recently been carried on, the villager has begun to question the justice of the taxation system (with regard to land rather than salt, the latter duty being a selected object of attack and no real grievance) and to adopt methods of passive resistance. Similarly in Oudh, the region lying in the center of the great northern plain, the payment of rent to landlords is being refused. But elsewhere, with rare local exceptions, the peasant remains quiescent and is occupied with other than political thoughts. \* \* \*

The Indian peasant ordinarily owns from three to twenty acres. In some provinces the tenant class is larger, but only in the south of India is the landless man, often a pariah or outcast, a major problem. The tenant's holding also will be of the same size, and his status is not necessarily below that of the peasant owner; but owners predominate, and, except in tracts favored with canal irrigation, draw a bare subsistence from a tired soil. \* \*

No scheme for the reform of the landlord can be produced in a few moments. A growing section of liberal opinion is in favor of his expropriation, with or without compensation.—"The Indian Village and the Indian Unrest," by C. F. Strickland in Foreign Affairs.

LET no one imagine that he has no influence. Whoever he may be, the man who thinks becomes a light and a power.—HENRY GEORGE.

# Outwitting Communism

(Broadcast by Franklin Wentworth Over Yankee Network From Boston Radio Station WAAB)

A GOOD many Americans are sick of official investigations, fact-finding projects and analyses of economic conditions. Even among radicals there is a growing impatience with, if not contempt for, the members of their fraternity who are still using the space afforded them in current periodicals to suggest that things in human society are awry. It would seem that this sort of economic writing has reached its logical limit, and further indulging in it will not advance us much. What we wish to be shown is what we may do. In what direction or along what path shall we travel? What is the desirable goal? And why is it desirable? If we can decide these questions even theo retically we may at least head in a hopeful direction, and thus perhaps find a first effective step.

#### RUSSIAN EXPERIMENT THRILLS MASSES

The present Russian experiment is attracting the good will of thousands who do not really favor communism because it reflects some sort of relief from present world wide stagnation and despair. The fact that the Russian are temporarily on limited food rations appears no seriou drawback to those who think of hardships endured b our Pilgrim fathers and the pioneers who settled our great West, who were also inspired by the notion that they were building a future desirable civilization. The uneasines that comes from the fact that the theory of society projected and so far evolved by the Soviets does not appear to us, is constantly modified by reports of good thing accomplished, and by the rather helpless conviction the there is a very real likelihood of a collective society of som sort displacing our present laissez-faire order, to which our children will be obliged to conform, if not ourselve

The masses of the people in every nation are being thrilled by the accomplishment in Russia of certain objectives the Western nations have aspired to but have not been able to achieve. There are many earnest souls, for example, concerned with the millions of people in the United States who are unable even to read official instruction for hygienic living, but we have never been able to laund any really collective effort to abolish this illiteracy. loosely organized nation cannot perhaps hope to do thin most effectively except when at war. War is obvious communistic. In war we sacrifice individuals for the common good and derive inspiration from it. The Russia are doing this in the cause of peace.

#### IMPATIENT FOR BETTER SOCIAL ORDER

Great economic changes have not always been cle to the one or two generations entangled in them, becau of the time element involved. We are now moving rapidly, however, that we should be able to foretell ar if wise enough, to readjust our lives to seemingly inevital

ents. Modern education is so general that when a sufient number desires to change the economic structure should be able to accomplish it without very much consion. Spain seems to be getting on pretty well. If world airs were not moving so rapidly, the United States might ift into something akin to communism without official ange in its laissez-faire policies by a rapid increase of ath duties until in a couple of generations all inheritance property should be abolished. It seems likely, however, at the masses are now too impatient for a better social der to wait for any such demonstration; the propertys and unemployed need food and work now. We must, viously, find a way in advance of too great an accumulan of social discontent to promote equality of oppornity. Some such resource might give a longer lease of to our ideas of individual initiative. The civilized world looking to those who have made such a success of modern siness to apply their intelligence to this problem. There buld be a better method to promote equality of opporhity than the one chosen by Russia. Somebody, or group, wever, has got to work out such a method and bring it o operation, in the face perhaps of considerable opposiin. Woodrow Wilson said that what the country needs a new and sincere thought in politics, coherently, disctly and boldly uttered by men who are sure of their ound. We must admit we do not see much of this sort thing in our American politics. Where there is not arrant culation or political cowardice there is bewilderment. is amazing to contemplate the meagre cultural backound of some of the men who are so effectively advancing Russian programme. Their potency resides in the fact t their thought, however much one may disagree with ir object, is clear.

#### CREAKING ECONÒMIC STRUCTURE

The muddy and timid thinking of American politics dom discloses anything real to vote for. This is the eam along which we may drift into communism. We realize it is intentionally muddied by private interest, twe as yet have no programme for its clarification. An ective programme can only be worked out around an a. When the Democratic party in the last Presidential ection let it be known that it meant no harm to the tariff, didn't seem to matter much to many which candidate selected. Our current economic distress is obviously wholly due to the present tariff, indefensible as it may it is due to the creaking of the economic structure of the entire world.

The same forces that are operating to pave the way to inmunism in America and England by piling up their hual budgets are operating in some form in every civid nation. Russia is merely an instance of a rather adden adjustment of these forces. The world unrest is tially the result of common education. What must be a reasingly met by those who are content with the present the problem of pacifying the many who are demand-

ing that the world's leaders in education and ability work out a more just and reasonable social order. Because of delay in this the masses are developing a willingness to attempt a solution on their own as Russia is doing, for they are looking in amazement at the biggest nation in the world getting along without the experienced political and religious leadership so long deemed indispensable, and not suffering greatly in contrast with the economic distress of the nations which still enjoy such leadership.

#### How May Communism BE AVERTED?

This is really what is disturbing most Americans about Russia. They believe that communism is an undesirable state which cannot ultimately prevail, while they are faced with the probability of having to pass through it. The educational example of the Russian experiment is terrific, and its persuasiveness lies in the fact that it seems to the masses so easy. We have only to continue to drift and we shall inevitably be called upon to adjust our lives to a similar regimented pattern.

How, then, may communism be averted? It obviously cannot be defeated by force. We might as well try to keep out smallpox with a picket fence. It is an idea with which we are confronted, and it can only be defeated by some other idea. Is there anywhere an effective idea which might be worked out and applied by ourselves while our destiny is still in our hands? Such an idea must obviously go deep enough to affect our economic structure. Some people at least must reorganize their lives. Making donations to relieve the unemployed will not sweep back the tide, and government works and commercial credits are merely a temporary makeshift which hastens the possible debacle. We shall either meet the communistic flood fatuously as the Bourbons did the republican tide in France and be hopelessly engulfed in it, or we must find a way to sluice the waters into some channel in which they will not sweep away our already weakened hold on individual initiative.

Is there a cog in the machinery of our so-called Western civilization that if readjusted or released might permit us to evade the communistic phase through which we are reluctant to pass? There is no doubt that there is. It is our treatment of the ownership and use of land. This is such a simple fact that its application would long since have corrected many of our social ills had its significance ever been correctly apprehended.

#### LAND GRANTS, WHITE PARASOLS AND ELEPHANTS

History is full of examples of the effect of the control by a relative few of land upon which many people must live. Almost every war has been concerned with the appropriation of certain productive areas of the earth. We can readily see the unhappy result when one nation appropriates the land of another nation; but the same sort of impoverishing effect upon peoples of the same nation resulting from some of their number owning their common heritage and exacting tribute in the form of rent for the

use of it, is more obscure; it is obscured by custom and its bad effects attributed to other causes. In the translation of an old Indian grant of land found at Tanna by Sir William Jones occur these luminous lines:

"To whomsoever the soil at any time belongs, to him belong the fruits of it. White parasols and elephants mad with pride are the flowers of a grant of land."

This has the agrarian flavor of early civilizations, but nevertheless a very modern application. The power of extracting unearned wealth has now been transferred in its magnitude from the ownership of tilled land to our fabulously valuable city sites. The great revenues are now produced by such land as lies in the hearts of London and New York. The assessed value of the land on Manhattan Island today is over \$5,000,000,000. It probably should be \$10,000,000,000 if correct inferences can be drawn from the fact that when a Fifth Avenue plot was recently sold for \$7,000,000 it was revealed as having been assessed on a valuation of \$2,500,000. The owners of these profitable sites in London, New York, Paris or Berlin and in all other settlements down to the small village, who are deriving their revenues from this unearned source, do not ordinarily display white parasols or otherwise flaunt their wealth. The land-owning families are usually of more than one generation. They do not live ostentatiously or do things in bad taste. They are often charitable, giving generously of their unearned wealth in times of social depression and subject to all the usual joys and sorrows of humanity except economic worry. They are not individually responsible for the long-developed system under which service is not demanded from them in exchange for the luxuries and comforts they enjoy.

#### SCARCITY OF LAND ARTIFICIAL

It is safe to assume that most people living by the appropriation of ground rents are wholly ignorant of the widespread social effect of such appropriation. People who work for a living are as a rule just as ignorant respecting it. Society having settled down through centuries to the assumption of the justifiability of people owning land which they can charge other people for the use of, it seems a logical item of investment. Individuals therefore seek to preempt and control desirable sites, creating an artificial scarcity of land and herding people into the cities, where their presence still further enhances site values. Very few people connect the operation of this system with the thought of social suffering and discontent. And yet it does not require very profound thought to trace a large flock of seemingly unrelated social ills to this one cause, for the bad effects of the feudal system are repeated in it.

We need not fear perhaps the medieval method of adjustment. The burning of the castles of the feudal lords by the tenantry was most often merely a personal revenge. The rebels did not challenge the system under which they were exploited. The communist method of attack is impersonal. The communists simply abolish titles, take possession of the land and buildings, apportion the living quarters under a routine plan, and make every able-bodied persorender some sort of service.

EXAMPLE, NOT PROPAGANDA, ENOUGH FOR RUSSIA

This appears a simple method of operation, complete hended by the most elementary intelligence, and hen the one which appeals strongly to the propertyless mass of all countries, who never would have believed it was easy as Russia has shown it to be. Russia does not ne to indulge in propaganda. Her example alone will ine tably make over the other civilized nations on her mod unless the intelligence of the people of these nations fo stall it by working out something better. One looks vain to the Americans at present in political life for a single utterance indicating a desire to do more than drift w the tide. A little badgering of the public-service corpo tions, a little grumbling about the tariff, a hesitant we or two about stock exchange methods, a little finance bolstering of decaying industries, and Congress leav the problem to solve itself.

It is in England, of all nations the most intelligent pol cally, and the one enjoying the most democratic gove ment, that the idea of the public right to ground re the appropriation of which as a purely social value alone defeat a communistic regime, seems occasion: to hover on the outskirts of practical politics. Some ye ago Mr. Lloyd George, in one of his clever flirtations w real issues, advanced the suggestion that the state sho take as a social asset future increments in land values, amount to be determined whenever the property transferred. While the landlords were disturbed by idea, it was not actually a menace to their privile for even if put into effect it would not very great cheapen land and thus make it easy for the present la less to become users. At best such a plan would oper only to discourage transfers of ownership, and would disturb the revenues from this source which are throu out England flowing into the pockets of the present pos sors of profitable sites.

KING GEORGE COMMENTS ON SITE VALUE OF LAND It was under the Labor Government, before Mr. Presented Snowden fell upstairs into the House of Lords, that in of King George's messages to Parliament the real was advanced; and the silence with which it was received by the radical English press indicated how included pletely the significance of this suggestion is apprehenced by editors who are honestly seeking plans of some betterment.

"My ministers," read the King's message, "projecto introduce legislation to secure for the community share in the site value of land."

This sounded rather like a casual fiscal expedient had deserving of attention outside of the meetings of but committees, and yet in it alone resides the potency can rescue England from eventual communism. To ther financial needs England is slowly confiscating three

exation the real estate of her people, buildings as well land. This is the communistic advance. The individalistic method is suggested by the King's message. uildings are rightfully private property. They are created y labor of brain and hand. They can be duplicated anyhere they are wanted. But land is not created by man. It value of city plots is a community value, created by the presence of people about it. If the people of London ere all to move to Cornwall, the plots around Trafalgar quare would have no more value than so much garden and. It is because England is permitting the private appropiation by individuals of her present community values bare land that she is forced to confiscate the buildings her citizens in the communistic fashion.

#### HENRY GEORGE'S PLAN FOR READJUSTMENT

No economic writer past or present has elucidated the onomic and spiritual penalties of our treatment of land ore clearly than Henry George, who oddly enough reived his first intelligent appreciation in England. It is rprising that one encounters so many Americans enjoyg educational opportunities who are not familiar either ith George's analysis of economic structures or the nple plan he advocates for their readjustment in response social needs. He shows with indisputable clearness that e idea of Quesnay to substitute one single tax on rent impot unique) for all other taxes, designed to save the ad of Louis XVI from the block, may be equally potent saving our present civilization from collapse. Naturally ere is little stimulation of interest in the proposal to ift the burden of taxation from buildings and improveents to ground rents, unless one can discern the striking cial effects of so simple a project.

For centuries the English have shown their ability to ing about great changes under old forms. That method their present difficulty is obviously possible. Ground it can be appropriated by taxation, the common right these community values being thus gradually absorbed thout severe jar or shock, and the common people reved of the heavy tax burdens which time and again have even them into revolution. The worst that could happen the English site owners would be the necessity of their ingultimately their personal abilities to make a living is does not appear a very hard fate to those who are eady doing it. With all their previous advantages of th, nourishment and education the children of the land-ds should make their way without difficulty.

#### GRADUAL SHIFTING OF TAXES TO GROUND RENTS

Normal youth does not face with fear the absence of scial privileges in a society that gives free play to the ercise of its faculties. And English statesmanship would ubtless be too wise to attempt complete immediate overy of these community values. The gradual shifts of taxes from personal property and improvements to bund rents would give individuals now absorbing these nmunity funds time to consider their personal adjust-

ments and find new and ligitimate investments for any capital they may possess.

Society gives no guarantee even by implication that it will not change its tax policy, and the private appropriation of site values is not the first form of special privilege to be so absorbed by the British commonwealth. In every civilized country, even the newest, the rental value of land taken as a whole is sufficient to bear the entire expenses of government. England might find that all of the site value need not be taken to finance her normal government operations. Land titles certainly need not be arbitrarily disturbed as the communists would disturb them. No owner of land need be dispossessed if he finds a use for it that may be profitable to him. Land held out of use merely in the hope of reaping increased community values would not of course be found profitable, but the release of such tracts would so stimulate building and productive capital as to bring recovery of prosperity in which the present possessors of privileges would themselves share. The release of frozen labor and capital through access to land, the only element upon which they can express themselves, would rapidly absorb England's unemployed.

#### SLOW TO ACT AGAINST TIDE OF COMMUNISM

Perhaps the English people and also the Americans may be too slow to recognize the significance and power expressed in the King's message to save themselves from the engulfing tide of communism. It will be difficult for workingmen to get over the idea that there is a real antagonism between capital and labor, and for small farmers and homestead owners to comprehend that to put all taxes on the value of land will not be unduly to tax them. Neither of these classes can easily be made to see that to exempt capital from taxation would not necessarily make a still wider division of rich and poor. These ideas spring from confused thought, and the difficulty in eradicating them lies in the fact that behind the ignorance and prejudice they reflect is an active, powerful selfish interest which has subtly dominated literature, education and opinion. This would be the stumbling block in the way of the indicated effort to preserve England from following Russia. The English landlords, like the French Bourbons, would be unlikely to let go. They might prefer to await the debacle. John Galsworthy suggests this in his recent admirable play "The Skin Game." But there might be some among them with spirit enough to take the chance. The English have an ideal of sportsmanship. Leaving aside the landless masses, there are many whose interests as land owners do not largely exceed their interests as bread winners or capitalists. Even the large land owners might see that their loss would be only relative. Many of them are in productive enterprises which would naturally be stimulated by relief from present confiscatory tax burdens. It might appear that by shifting a larger part of the English budget on the non-producer it would make no one poorer except those who can be made a great deal

poorer without being really hurt, and thus reapportion the great unearned fortunes without impoverishing anybody.

Many people would agree that such a policy is worth adopting in the cause of social justice without any special emergency to justify it; but facing the present menace of world communism it would seem that the adoption of a method of social readjustment so certain to arrest growing discontent would be welcomed as an obvious resource of self-preservation.

# A Plea in Avoidance

FOLLOWING is a letter to the New Republic written by Franklin H. Wentworth, of Wellesley Hills, Mass.:

"I am accepting your invitation to renew my subscription because I believe publications of protest should be supported and not because I personally derive any information or comfort from your paper. There is equally competent guidance toward an improved social order in the editorials of the Journal of Commerce. Why can you not occasionally refer to a fundamental wrong that can be corrected by our present political machinery without drifting into revolution? I mean the absorption by privileged individuals of the community value of land. Is it timidity that causes you to be so continuously silent on this important item? The taking of these land values by taxation would not solve all our social ills, but it would clear the political slate of a lot of the problems we are now tilting at in the notion that they are fundamental. Do you think it would hurt your circulation to cease being vaguely socialistic for a time and concentrate on some social ill that can be tackled and corrected by the present generation? It might help it!"

Here is the reply from Bruce Bliven, one of the New Republic editors:

"Thank you for your letter of April 26. I am glad to tell you that the editors of the New Republic are thoroughly familiar with the principles of the Single Tax and are far from being unsympathetic with the general philosophy expounded by Henry George. Perhaps the chief reason why we do not devote more space to the consideration of this subject in the New Republic is that this journal is primarily a weekly newspaper devoted to the discussion of current events, and that so little has happened in regard to the Single Tax in recent years. As you probably know, both the agitation for this tax and the various experiments in its operation are now both practically at a standstill.

"In general, our criticism of the Single Tax philosophy at the present stage of the world is that it is too conservative, does not go far enough in its demand for an alteration of the fundamentals of society. It was worked out by Henry George in a period of scarcity-economics; and no one has ever successfully adapted it to present conditions, which, at least in terms of consumer purchasing power, constitute a period of surplus-economics."

We ask our readers to note the confession, not openly avowed but implied, that the *New Republic* has a policy which is to favor only such principles as are accepted by a large section of the people—in other words, the principles that are acclaimed. Its programme of social reform—and that it has one is its only reason for being—is thus, by its own declaration, narrowly circumscribed. There will be no reason, therefore, for any reader to consult its pages for any specific condemnation of false issues which command a measure of popular approval. It is a humiliating confession, but we are glad to have it, for we were

anxious to know just what the New Republic stood for We know now that it stands for just nothing at all.

We note, too, that what Henry George advocated is "to conservative." Just what is it that Henry George taugh He advocated the transference of thirteen billions annual of publicly created wealth now absorbed by private appropriators into the common treasury in lieu of all taxatic the result of which would be the restoration of every unus natural opportunity, mine, forest, city lot and farm leto the actual workers. That proposition has teeth. I stead of being conservative, it is the most radical proposever presented for the consideration of mankind. Fit alongside of everything and anything we find in the pages of the New Republic.

Not the strongest magnifying glasses applied to the weekly publication extending over any period of yeareveal anything but a skim-milk, rose-water socialist an ineffable dilution that must give even a Socialist I Norman Thomas a large-sized pain! And Mr. Blive who should and we believe does know better, has the net to call the doctrine of a free earth "conservative." shudder to think what he would consider a radical propose Certainly nothing that has appeared in the wholly inocupages of the New Republic can be called radical. The can be found nothing therein to offend the adolesc reformer still in the nursery stage. Where and how I Bliven has persuaded himself that compared with He George the New Republic is radical is one of those interies which we leave to others for solution.

Will our readers note the curious language with when Mr. Bliven concludes? Mr. B. is a journalist, accustor to plain, direct speaking. Either this language is in polated by some one else, or Mr. B. has unconscious absorbed the phrases of his associates that obviate necessity of thinking hard. Mr. Bliven should know the Henry George set himself to determine the problem distribution. The period of "surplus-economics," where we understand to mean a large per capita production wealth, or a period when per capita production is has nothing to do with the solution which Mr. George given. He was concerned with only one thing—the plem of distribution. And that remains the same to as when he wrote.

# Association in Inequality

WHEN the wages are invariably low, distribution wealth being thus very unequal, the distribution political power and social influence will also be very equal. All of these ancient civilizations reached a cere development and fell away. Where we find the unclasses enormously rich, and the lower classes miser poor, we find those by whose labor the wealth is created in the smallest share of it, the remainder be absorbed by the higher ranks in the form of either respondit.—Buckle.

# For Congressmen to Read

By Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts, addressing the senate:

Mr. President, following a speech delivered by me in the closing lays of the last session outlining what I believe to be some of the chief auses of the economic depression in this country, I received many omments from various groups and individuals.

One statement, which I consider a real contribution to the solution of the present economic problems, is by George W. Anderson, a retired

ustice of the United States Circuit Court at Boston.

I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Finance and be printed a the Record (appears in Record of Dec. 19, 1931). A synopsis of be statement by Judge Anderson follows:

#### A FEW OBSERVATIONS ON OUR AMERICAN SYSTEM

The main purpose of this writing is analysis and description only; orrely a record of observations on our American system.

For fifty years of adult life I have observed and studied American nstitutions. Recurrent periods of business depression and business rosperity have marked the whole half century. Our fatalistic economists call these cyclical and inevitable. In the present depression think I observe some significant differences.

There is a lack of the general optimism characteristic of the earlier and times, more conceded bewilderment over both causes and prosects. There is more intelligent doubt of the soundness of capitalism, nore doubt of the value of competition and the anti-trust acts, less aith (perhaps less desire) of success in the fight against Big Business.

There is no general acceptance of the old panacea for most business roubles—reduction of wages. Rather is there a considerable recogition of the fact that only by increasing the purchasing power of the bass of wage earners can any adequate market be made for our large

urplus output in every line. \* \* \*

No one can conceive of any intelligent man now doing what Andrew arnegie did in 1886—writing a book and entitling it "Triumphant Democracy." \* \* \* With over 500 individual incomes exceeding million dollars and 26 exceeding \$5,000,000, we have at least 6,000,000 industrial unemployed, reducing probably 25,000,000 of our citizens odire poverty, many of them to actual suffering. The "abolition of overty" is not a shining success.

Turning to ownership, it is commonly accepted that about 4 per ent of our people own 80 per cent of the country's property. Morever, comparative analysis of the income-tax returns for a period of ears seems to show a steady drift toward an increasing concentration oth of property and income. \* \* \* It may well be questioned whether he inequality, both in property holding and in current income, is not slatively as great now as under the feudal system. Such democracy we have had for two generations has been, in the main, grounded on he homestead act of 1862. Under this act settlers were enabled to et at small cost 160 acres of fertile public land. This resulted in sillions of independent farmers establishing wholesome homes in the dississippi Valley. They were the backbone of our democracy. But ur drift for several decades has been urban and industrial. The purces of our excessively large fortunes and incomes are mainly:

(1) Urban land values and ground rents, all unearned, socially reated.

(2) Subsurface deposits of minerals and metals, also unearned, ne rightful property of the whole people.

- (3) Profits derived from corporation manipulations, various forms f stock waterings, largely in public utilities (privately owned monoplies), the rates of which are, in essence, taxes. This source probbly grounds more unearned incomes and property than the first two ources.
- (4) Inheritances, which tend to perpetuate and increase the inqualities, mostly originally derived from one or all of the first three purces.

Urban and subsurface values in land may be buttressed under our

Constitutions, Federal and State. Doubtless by taxation a partial recognition of the public right therein might be secured.

1. For land permanently destined to agricultural uses, a fee title to surface rights would plainly be the soundest public policy, if the occupants were, generally, the owners. But the great increase in tenant farmers and a rack-renting system have put this policy in serious question. The chief defect in this policy, however, is that farming land does not always and everywhere remain farming land. Manhattan Island was once a farming community; when it became a great merchandising and financial city, the heirs and grantees of the original land owners acquired huge unearned fortunes (like the Astors), all created by the teeming population and their customers. Except in degree this result in New York City is typical of the situation in the whole nation, now become predominantly urban.

Henry George a half century ago showed the inevitable results of this theory and propounded his remedy in "Progress and Poverty." No effective step has been taken toward asserting the irrefutable public rights to the socially created, unearned increment in urban lands. Neither the Single Tax nor any other remedy has been adopted.

- 2. Private ownership of subsurface minerals and metals grounded the Rockefeller billionaire fortune. It also gave us the coal and iron police of Pennsylvania, the inhuman labor conditions in the West Virginia coal fields, and a horde of steel, copper, oil, etc., multimillionaires, many of them highly undesirable citizens.
- 3. Some aspects of corporation manipulation, particularly by our investment bankers, were dealt with by Mr. Louis D. Brandeis (now Mr. Justice Brandeis) seventeen years ago in his book entitled "Other People's Money and How the Bankers Use It." All the evils that he there so brilliantly portrayed are, I think, yet in full force and operation.

Bonuses running as high as a million dollars a year to a single executive seem a new device for enriching the insiders at the expense of the powerless small investors in some of our great corporations.

The history of the last four years puts in fair question the value of our present leadership in business, economics, banking and government. The first two years were marked by a wild and senseless gambling craze—as groundless as the Mississippi bubble—encouraged, even instigated, from high official sources.

The last two years have shown an inevitable reaction, with a bewildered and helpless confusion in all quarters never equalled within the memory of man. \* \* \*

A fundamental principle—the slogan—of our present ruling classes is "no government in business." Curiously and inconsistently, we have the spectacle of the Federal Government, in utter disregard of constitutional limitations, going "into business" through the Farm Board and expending hundreds of millions of dollars in the purchase of wheat and cotton. A cruder, more unintelligent, sporadic form of socialism cannot be imagined. \* \* \* A great experiment in state socialism is apparently now being carried on in Russia. Its results are being watched with great interest by most of our intelligent classes—with great fear by the subservient, highly vocal organs of our present chaotic and planless capitalistic system. \* \*

We now see much discussion of an "American plan," apparently to be made by an "economic council" with "a board of strategy and planning to survey productive facilities and consumption capacity." Assuming such "economic council" and its output of a very wise plan, who could make it operative?

Dr. Nicholas Butler's suggestion that our statesmen and economists might well read and consider "Progress and Poverty" is the only intimation that I have seen from any responsible, capitalistic source that limiting the opportunities for individual acquisition of socially created property might do something for the hard times. No one else (so far as I have seen) has ventured to suggest that we adopt the policy of "rendering unto Cæsar the things that belong to Cæsar."

All governments are, on adequate analysis, oligarchies. The United States is no exception; only in form is it democratic—or even

republican. Our Government has, fairly enough, been called an "invisible government." The number of our real rulers may not be more than in Russia or Italy—probably less than in England. There is not and never has been any such thing as a "government of the people, by the people, for the people" anywhere, at any time. It is a non-existent trinity. The most to be sought—or even hoped for—is government for the people. \* \* \*

There is no visible sign that we shall substantially limit the present opportunities for predatory wealth, cut down the existing methods of exploitation, both of productive labor and of natural resources. "Individualism," as its proponents really mean it, connotes keeping essentially all of the outstanding methods of heaping up large fortunes and excessive, unearned incomes. We have no respect for property rights grounded on productive work only. Getting-not producing-we regard as sacred under our Constitution. "Normalcy" with us is a predatory and aleatory capitalism. Instead of promoting individualism and personal incentive of an honest and wholesome kind, it is discouraged. A "rugged individualism" is not legitimately grounded on gambling chances for acquiring unearned natural resources, properties socially created, or properties produced by others. An economic system in which property rights should be approximately grounded on useful work, not inconsistent with social welfare, might be called either capitalistic or socialistic, but it would be a tolerent organization and infinitely preferable to our present chaotic and grossly unjust "American system," which does not work.

Evolution to a better system—not revolution—is the desideratum. Revolutions ordinarily are but new forms of chaos and waste; evolution, though frequently slow and disappointing, is generally constructive.

# Death of Gerrit Johnson

THE Single Tax movement has lost a great and good friend in the death of Gerrit Johnson, whose gifts to the cause for the last fifteen years must total a large sum.

He died in Los Angeles, where he was accustomed to spend the winters, on March 15. He maintained his residence in Grand Rapids, Mich. He was a cripple, but it was not his own affliction but the maladies of the world which drew from him that whole-hearted sympathy which animated the man. But he did not stop with mere expressions of sympathy. To "Luke North" during his several campaigns he gave generously. To the Fels Fund he made many gifts. To LAND AND FREEDOM he was a liberal giver. Indeed, it is impossible to catalogue the activities for which when he approved of them his purse was not opened.

He held advanced ideas. Even as to the Georgist principles he was many steps in advance of those who favor more or less cautious approaches to the desired goal. His contributions to the Grand Rapids papers rang like bullets, and he had a style of expression that lent strength to his appeals for the doctrines he espoused.

Yet he was a gentle man withal, of a certain modest reticence, and rarely given to idle talk. A very serious man, who felt deeply, thought seriously.

He was, too, a successful business man. A native of the Netherlands, he was brought to Grand Rapids by his parents when he was nine years of age. He learned the cigar making trade, and in 1884 started in business for himself. He was widely known for his expert knowledge of tobaccos and was one of the first to import Java wrappers. He was the creator of the "Dutch Masters" cigar, though he had originated quite a number of other well-known brands. In 1919 he retired from business. He was sixty-eight when he died. The movement has lost one of its great souls.

Not long before his death he contributed to the *Michigan Tradesman* an article entitled "The Cause of Crime," from which we quote the following:

How well I remember some years ago before I had read Henry George's "Progress and Poverty." I then still belonged to the sobsister class and was filled with the missionary zeal, ranting about the horrible conditions of our Kent County jail and poorhouse. I was then so unsophisticated that I still thought we could treat our unfortunates decently. In my innocence I did not know that "doing unto others as you would have them do unto you" was a physical impossibility under our present economic system. I did not know that what we call Christian civilization depended upon brutality and not upon love. Do you not see that if we treated our unfortunates as we ourselves would like to be treated there would be such an influx in our jails and poorhouses and the giving of charity that this whole Christendom would bust up in business.

I had some experience with a prison farm, and it was there I had my eye-teeth cut. I learned how futile it was to talk about reforming without taking into consideration economic questions. We pride ourselves on running a prison farm which was surrounded only by fence, the same as any other farm; no barred windows, no handcuffs no swords or pistols. This prison farm was void of any prison atmos phere and we had good food and beds. We did not have any trouble with men trying to break out, but we did have trouble keeping me from breaking in. Our prison farm was a success until the war brok out and as jobs became more plentiful prisoners became more scarce and then we had to pay men for working who formerly worked for nothing. The result was our prison farm busted up in business, and that experience convinced me that we can measure crime waves by th number of men out of jobs. Now when I see a reformer trying to wall in the footsteps of Jesus without attempting to straighten out our eco nomic conditions I would liken him unto a man who is filled to th brim with bootleg trying to walk a crack. \* \*

Yet in spite of what I may have said I am still an optimist, with faith in the future, firmly believing that when we Americans get ou political bearings we will be able to put our prisons and poorhouse in a museum to show the future generation what barbarians we were in this barbaric age.

POOR Irish folk came wandering over these moors My dame makes it a rule to give to every son of Adar bread to eat, and supplies his wants to the next house But here are thousands of acres which might give there all meat and nobody to bid these poor Irish go to the moor and till it. They burned the stacks, and so found a watto force the rich people to attend to them.

—Carlyle (in Scotland), 1833.

LIBERTY consists in the right to do whatever is no contrary to the rights of others; thus exercise of the natural rights of each individual has no limits other that those which secure to other members of society enjoyment of the same rights.—Thomas Paine.

### As to Interest

I

DEAR A-

If, as you claim, the interest question is a purely academic question, then the whole subject may well be left to the time when ground rent is taken for public uses. But like Banquo's ghost this question comes to plague us and will not down. A question cannot be put aside as purely academic which has already led to a clear division in our anks. Anger reddens the face of many a Single Taxer when the slightest criticism is ventured against those sacred hapters in "Progress and Poverty" in which the theory of interest is laid down. "Traitor! disturber! fool! mbecile! falsifier! enemy of science!" are the outbursts we seem to remember hearing.

As a well-informed student you will recall that from the very first appearance of "Progress and Poverty" there were not wanting critics who pointed out that the vulnerable spot in the shining armor of Henry George was to be ound in his defense of interest. Especially did the Gernans, who had greeted the book with enthusiasm (its sale was enormous everywhere), object to the dictum that interest is not an arbitrary but a natural thing; it is not he result of a particular social organization but of laws f the universe which underlie society. It is, therefore, ust." This pronouncement estranged the working classes f the world and weaned them away from a movement which suddenly ceased to interest them. They have been all to it ever since.

You may say that, after all, a defection such as this is matter of minor importance. But is it? When Henry seorge said he was "for men" and not for a class, did he spect that so large a class as the working class, whose overty was the very cause of all his labor as thinker and riter, would he alienated and continue indifferent? One annot believe this, flattering as it may be to the selecter ricles of our Georgist intelligentsia.

What was it that cooled the ardor of the working masses the "Henry George theory"? Was it some weakess discovered in the book itself, some train of illogical assoning that led to strange and unexpected conclusions, ome fatal flaw that vitiated an otherwise noble and eautiful work of art? Such indeed appears to have been the case.

How can this be explained?

Henry George, while in fact proposing a most radical lange in the current postulates of political economy, a amplete reversal of accepted dogmas and a profound teration of society's basic structure, yet was not keen lough to see that his proposals were utterly impossible execution within the strangling bonds of the existing sisting society. He proposed to proceed step by step an attempt to reduce taxes, in order that a greater amount economic rent might be collected in their place—a futile an, which after fifty years of devoted propaganda has

not yet even begun to function. He would, for some occult reason, adopt the conventional terminology of a political economy which he wished to undermine, involving himself in a struggle to make plausible and more readily acceptable conclusions that were utterly worthless. For example, he stated that "in truth, the primary division of wealth in distribution is dual, not tripartite—not between land, labor and capital, but between land and labor." Yet essaying to add improvements to the structure already reared by the great writers on political economy rather than to bring their edifices crashing down to ruin, he must needs retain one important prop or shoring from their lumber-yard which has rendered his own tower of very doubtful stability. What I particularly refer to is his whole treatment of capital and interest.

\* \* \*

"To what are we to attribute the present-day persistence and continuance of interest in the midst of plenty such as the world has never before seen or dreamed of, and in spite of powers of production, of powers of Nature, such as the greatest seers and wisest men of prior generations could never conceive of? Is this due, as so many suppose, and as even that great economist Henry George contended, "to the laws of the universe which underlie society," or is it but the result of our particular social organization, the main peculiarities of which, partially adapted though it has been to modern requirements, we have inherited from bygone generations? In other words, is interest natural and therefor unavoidable and equitable—or is it merely one of those symptoms which betray the presence of special privileges in the body politic?"—Lewis H. Berens, "Toward the Light," p. 161.

II

DEAR A-

With parrot-like reiteration comes the tiresome formula: "The three factors are land, labor and capital; the return to capital is interest." A slight variation, hailed by its author as a great scientific discovery, is the following: "Wealth used as a tool in the production of more wealth is capital; and in the wealth so produced is the interest due the owner of the capital and the wages due labor for the effort involved." A very favorite illustration given is that of the little child who goes into the berrypatch with a basket and gathers berries-the result of the picking being both wages and interest. No need here to include the idea of borrowing and lending. The "interest" just attaches itself to those berries, the amount of said interest being well recognized by the little girl or her parents, as the case may be. Now I could never see why the child's pinafore would not have sufficed, or if necessary even its fist, save that the labor expended in bringing home the berries would have been less efficient. If there was no monopoly in baskets, then the use of baskets was the conventional way of gathering or producing berries, an extension of the earlier mode of putting them in a big leaf for conveyance or into one's mouth for immediate consumption. Query: Should our economist not also include the child's clothes as part of its tools, since they protect the child from the briars during the operation of gathering? The fact is that without a monopoly or a patent right, tools become part and parcel of society's inheritance from the past, the knowledge how to use them becoming an easy conventional acquisition, and labor, while certainly being thereby rendered more efficient, can gain no special advantage under the law of supply and demand. Every advantage derivable from the growth of the arts in production, in invention and in the advances of scientific knowledge is absorbed in rent.

\* \* \*

"As everybody knows, Nature yields more to labor when making use of tools than when working unaided; and this increase in the productive power of labor was confidently regarded as ample justification of interest, of that portion of the produce of labor which under existing conditions accrues to the owners of capital as a premium for the use of their possessions. This theory was strenuously upheld by Bastiat, who was indeed so confident of its truth that, as far as he was concerned, he practically staked the reputation of the existing social organization on its correctness. Henry George refutes this theory in a manner which leaves nothing to be desired. After pulverizing Bastiat's off-quoted illustration of the Plane, George concludes as follows: 'Is interest, then, natural and equitable? There is nothing in this illustration to show it to be so. Evidently what Bastiat (and many others) assigns as the basis of interest-the power which exists in the tool to increase the productiveness of labor-is neither in justice nor in fact the basis of interest. The fallacy which makes Bastiat's illustration pass as conclusive with those who do not stop to analyze it, is that with the loan of the plane they associate 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 was 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. The essential thing which James loaned to William was not the privilege of applying his labor in a more effective way, but the use of the concrete result of ten days' labor.""-Lewis H. Berens, "Toward the Light," pp. 163-166.

#### III

#### DEAR A-

If you mean that under the existing system of private ownership of land interest is inevitable, you are certainly right, the all-sufficient reason being that the investor can now freely traffic in land rents and many forms of spurious capital, and he would be foolish not to look for an equal return for his money in the note, loan or bond market—and he gets it.

In the happier time to come, while land rent will greatly increase, it will accrue only to the public, the selling price of land disappearing and no income from this source being available to the private investor or speculator. Thereby the ground will be cut from under the feet of the would-be interest-monger.

Moreover, wealth (which includes capital) will be vastly more abundant and more evenly distributed—while he who saves wealth for any reason whatever will be confronted with the inevitability of its disintegration. Instead of increasing with time it will tend with time naturally to fade away. It takes continuous watching and labor to preserve wealth from decaying, moulding, rusting,

dry-rotting, withering, spoiling, corroding, wearing out, or going to ruin. Its final disappearance is inevitable. Labor is kept at work incessantly reproducing the capital of the world. Geo. L. Rusby in his book "Smaller Profits," 4th edition, p. 27, says, "Indeed, one would look far to find in use today any capital two generations old." So it seems to me that he who happens to have a surplus of saved wealth will think himself fortunate if, by loaning it to a borrower, the latter assumes the burden of its maintenance and restores it at the expiration of the term in the same condition it was in when he received it.

\* \* \*

"Henry George essayed to explain and uphold interest as follows 'While many things might be mentioned which, like money o planes or engines or clothing, have no innate power of increase, ye other things are included in the terms wealth and capital which, like wine, will of themselves increase in quality up to a certain point, or like bees or cattle, will of themselves increase in quantity; and certain other things, such as seeds, which, though the conditions which enabl them to increase may not be maintained without labor, yet will, whe these conditions are maintained, yield an increase or give a return over and above that which is to be attributed to labor.' examine seriatim each one of the illustrations advanced by George i support of his view. 'If I put away wine,' he says, 'at the end of a year I will have an increased value, for the wine will have increased i quality.' Well, we would advise our readers to consult a wine-growe as to the force of this argument as a defense of interest: he would te us that any such appreciation was the reward of his labor, not of h capital-was wages, not interest. Moreover, if wine-storers we enabled to earn specially high wages, more people would be attracted to that calling, more wine would be stored, until the value of wir and the earnings of wine-storers were both reduced to the norm level. Again he tells us that 'supposing that in a country adapted i them I set out bees; at the end of a year I will have more swarn of bees and the honey which they have made.' Quite so, but a apiarist would smile at this 'illustration'; for, without having studie political economy, experience would have taught him that, despi the fact that his bees collect their spoils heedless of the legaliz privileges of neighboring land-holders, all the honey, etc., he obtai is but the reward of the labor necessary to look after his swarms as collect the honey; that in fact his gains are wages, not interest. A moreover, that if his earnings exceeded those obtainable in other simil pursuits, some of his neighbors would also set out bees, until the mark value of honey, which depends on supply and demand, would reduced, as well as the earnings of those engaged in its production Lastly, he argues that, 'supposing where there is a range I turn of sheep or hogs or cattle; at the end of the year I will, upon the avera also have an increase.' The same reasoning applies to this illustration If such animals are turned out on a range on the margin of cu vation, any such natural increase would represent the natural wa of those who devoted their labor to turning them out and collect them in. If such animals are turned out upon better land, any si increase represents wages and rent. If those engaged in these ind tries are earning more than their brother-workers engaged in simi pursuits, some of these will be attracted to these more remunerat industries, until the increased supply reduces the market value of commodities they produce, as well as their earnings; or, owing the increased demand for the use of such 'natural opportunities the rental value of the land is increased. From all of which it evident that this natural increase which Henry George advances as natural basis of interest is in truth the natural recompense or wa of those engaged in certain departments of industry. As already repeatedly emphasized, Man can create nothing. All he can do is

collect the material Nature provides and adapt it to his requirements, and to avail himself of the natural reproductive forces, the active power of Nature, the principle of growth, of reproduction, that those engaged in certain of the primary industries, as farmers, cattle-raisers, agriculturists, horticulturists, apiarists, etc., have to rely on for their wages. Hence they cannot be invoked as the natural basis of interest, or as any 'justification' of interest as both natural and just."—Lewis H. Berens, "Toward the Light," pp. 167–171.

#### IV

#### DEAR A-

It is also held by Georgists that the element of time enters into the phenomenon of interest. But Time cannot be differentiated nor considered apart from the methods of Nature. When we speak of Land we include the whole gamut of natural forces, processes as far apart in the element of Time as the ages-long laying down of the coalmeasures from the instantaneous energy of electricity. It seems to me, on the contrary, that, far from being allied to the ways of Nature, and partaking of its manifestations, interest finds its origin in adventitious circumstances and persists under unnatural surroundings. It is all very well to say that capital is wealth used in the production of more wealth—such a description would seem to define tools and machines—but capital in itself produces nothing, it wears out, and even so it takes labor to set the machine going, and the machine itself is but a combination of nodes of energy and mechanical advantages. Everything n the universe is of energy compounded, a machine being out an extension of human energy. The multiform modes of power that so distinguish modern invention are upon nalysis all to be found acting within the human microcosm. So that the economic factors of land and labor are sufficient to cover the case. I think that a treatise on political economy might be written in which no mention need be made of either capital or interest, and I feel sure he terms would not be missed. The utmost that can e expected from the use of wealth is its maintenance or eplacement. Otherwise, whether it be the product of and and labor devoted to the satisfaction of human desires ir that form that is designated as wealth in the course of xchange, in neither case is there increase in measurable nergy—nothing is discoverable beyond an interchange of one form of energy into the other, viz., the interchange rom kinetic energy into potential energy, or vice versa. eaving aside what is called Spurious Capital, which is a compound of monopoly and special privilege, with a power o levy tribute in the shape of dividends, interest and profits, what is the "interest" we are here concerned with and what is its origin? It is a convention of modern times pringing from poverty (lack of wealth) on the one hand ind superabundance of unearned possessions on the other. ts beneficiaries are landlords, bankers and investors who in the current maldistribution of wealth find easy ind willing clients in the millions of the poor. If one

were asked to describe as tersely as possible the world as it is in essence, one would make no mistake by calling it a world of debt and a world in debt. From the treasuries of the greatest nations down to the slim resources of the average man, all are head and shoulders in debt. The borrower must have money; the lender is ready to accommodate at a price. Debtor and creditor. Do we have here an equally balanced twain, a double-star that might have swum into the ken of Emerson while writing his essay on Compensation? Not so, unless in the equilibrium of forces we are to justify master and slave, rent-lord and serf, conqueror and conquered, executioner and victim. For the debtor is ever the product and the sign of poverty. For him prisons have been built. He is the outcast, the broken man, the bankrupt. Our debts are not forgiven, for we never forgive our debtors-not for us the Lord's Prayer in this practical, business age!

\* \* \*

"The gains of banking usually take the form of interest, and interest is money paid for the use of money. Money has no power of increase in itself, but its power to draw interest depends upon the fact that it can be exchanged for sites, which produce rent. (It is curious to note that interest has always been looked at askance in all ages, forbidden by religion after religion.) The fact that it enables so many people to lead a life of permanent idleness, supported by the labor of others, is another reason for criticising interest. If I save ten thousand dollars from my earnings, by all means let me spend it; but to tell me that I and my heirs are thereby entitled to six hundred dollars a year for a million years, and then for another million years thereafter, is pure moonshine on its face. (But is the allowance of interest necessary to the saving of sufficient capital to keep our industries in a state of efficiency and provide for their expansion?) Squirrels and bees save without receiving any bonus upon their savings, and men can doubtless acquire the same wisdom if they try. It is sometimes stated that the essence of interest consists in the fact that men prefer to enjoy a thing now to postponing the enjoyment of it to the future, and hence that they will always pay a bonus for anticipating the use of it. But may we not expect the advent of a more philosophical frame of mind which will allow the trouble of preserving the desired thing to offset the annoyance of waiting for it?" -Ernest Crosby, "Labor and Neighbor," pp. 143-147.

"All commodities as soon as produced inevitably tend to deteriorate and decay. Houses, machinery, clothing, food, etc., how long will these remain serviceable or enjoyable unless constantly subject to that care and supervision which the labor of men can alone bestow? Hence if it be argued that the lender renders the solvent honest borrower a service by transferring to him the use or command of enjoyable or serviceable commodities without the immediate return of their value, it may be answered that the borrower also renders the lender a service by preserving his possessions or their value for him for future use and enjoyment. For unless those desirous of preserving their savings for future use can find someone else willing to undertake this necessary work, they would themselves have to devote some of their own labor to the preservation of their possessions. The question therefore really resolves itself into this: Under natural and equitable conditions, would possible lenders be able to command a premium for the loan of their possessions; or would honest and solvent borrowers be able to command a premium for preserving the possessions of their fellows for future use? Or would the one service, the loan, counterbalance the other service, the preservation; and hence neither a

premium for the use nor a premium for the preservation be obtainable, but both parties to the transaction be satisfied by the return of the commodity lent, or its value in some other commodity that may be mutually agreed upon?—Lewis H. Berens, "Toward the Light," pp. 158–161.

"Interest is a product of the private appropriation of rent, and would disappear with the public collection of rent. So long as it is possible to exchange the tokens of wealth or capital for a piece of the earth's surface which humanity must have in order to live and reproduce its kind, nobody will lend his wealth for any other purpose, unless he can get a return for it equivalent to what he can get by investing it in land values; but if you take that right away from him by collecting the full annual value of land and using it for public purposes, then the people with capital would either need to work themselves in order to preserve their wealth or get somebody to take it and preserve it for them. It is a characteristic of all wealth that as soon as production ceases decomposition sets in, and with nearly all wealth that decomposition is very rapid. Under such conditions the natural relationship between capital and labor would soon be established, and that relationship might be expressed thus: the service which labor renders to capital by preserving it would be the equivalent of the service which capital renders to labor by increasing its productive power. With cent collected and used for community purposes, and capital available to any one who wanted to use it by simply giving adequate guarantee of returning it when it was required by its owner, all power of economic exploitation of man by his fellows would disappear."-Sir George Fowlds, in Auckland (New Zealand) Liberator.

V

#### DEAR A-

Finally let us consider another phase of the interest question which Georgists are prone to belittle—just that common garden variety of interest which the borrower pays to the money-lender. This sort of interest is, according to our friends, a mere side issue, unworthy of scientific classification—a case of the tail wagging the dog. It is in vain that you point out that the common man understands what you are talking about when you mention this kind of interest; the answer is that the common man is a negligible person in this great argument, and that it must be repeated that capital bears interest because we tell you so; we feel it, we believe it, we know it. Besides, we never discuss this branch of the subject with the common man. It would be only waste of time.

Let me sum up before I close. In maintaining that the interest question is a purely academic question, orthodox Georgists from their point of view appear to be right. Aloft in their ivory towers, within their sacred groves, they look out upon the world with a calm, positive, secure and disinterested spirit, as befits philosophers absolutely satisfied that truth is theirs, theirs is truth—that this is all they know on earth, and all ye need to know.

\* \* \*

"As to interest, they could fix it themselves in precisely the same manner as they fixed the rent, and as in the case of rent the highest offer would of course be accepted, everything below par being prudently decined. I should then have them by the wool, and if they failed in their payments it would be the easiest thing in the world to sell them out. They might bewail their lot, but business is business. They

should have worked harder and been more provident; whatever inconvenience they might suffer, it would be their concern and not mine. What a glorious time I would have of it! Rent and interest, interest and rent, and no limit to either, excepting the ability of the workers to pay."—Mark Twain, "The Story of Archimedes."

"A capitalist primarily lends money, and before he can lend it it must be spare. The borrower merely pays usury; to what use he puts the money does not enter into the question. It will be apparent that the 'Capitalistic System' is a delicate term for a colossal pawn-brokering business.—R. F. Dyson, "Natural Prosperity," p. 41.

"Once spare money commences to bear interest, interest soon becomes the Pirate King. Every industrial enterprise or business has to pay its pound of flesh, which must be passed on to the consumer. Taxes are similarly handed on. It is the consumer who pays the final snowball of tribute over the counter."—Ditto, p. 49.

"If it were not for the Bankruptcy Law and Court, producers who could not meet their obligations would then become the chattels of their creditors. That is what happened in the days of ancient Rome. Our present Bankruptcy Court is about the only mark of social progress which this civilization can show."—Ditto, p. 75.

"This system concentrates ownership and control of capital in the hands of people who had nothing whatever to do with its production. As a consequence, those who produce the wealth get little, if anything, more out of it than they must spend on their living. As a result, when a productive enterprise of any magnitude is to be started little money is to be found among those who are to do the productive work. It must be financed principally if not wholly by outsiders who neither can nor will take any part in the production but expect to divide between themselves as much as possible of the proceeds. As shareholders, bondholders and capitalists generally they are in matter of fact nothing but money-lenders to the producers who by their labor pay them dividends, interest and taxes out of the wealth they produce—and have not a voice in the councils of the busi ness or an interest in its welfare. Finance is the ruling power; labor skill and productive intelligence are but tributary subjects, tolerated because useful and more or less abused and despised."-S. Tideman "Radicalia," pp. 54-55.

"In the vicissitudes of business, which such a system necessarily entails, the smaller and weaker members and groups of the financial element will from time to time be crowded out and their holding absorbed by the larger and stronger ones, until finally the whole matchinery of finance becomes centered and controlled by a small group forming a distinct class as useful to the producers as rats in the pantry Ditto, pp. 64-65.

"As a standing fiscal policy the Credit System is deservedly popular, for it is the finest shell game that was ever invented. With infall ble certainty Finance accumulates the producer's money and not ing can beat it. No law can circumvent it as long as the rental value of land is treated as private property."—Ditto, pp. 61-62.

"A little thought shows that the producing part of the popultion cannot, under the present system, accurately speaking, entinto the market as consumers of any of the commodities which they haproduced any more than can machinery. That portion of commodities which they consume as producers represented by salaries at wages is only their upkeep and replacement. Strictly speaking, producers they are only machines, and machinery cannot be said enter into the market in a commercial sense as a consumer of the commodities it produces. The salaries and wages they get represent the commodities necessary for their upkeep and replacement, the sar as any other industrial machinery, and no more and no less."—"T

Fundamental Principles of Economics," Charles J. Townsend and Walter L. Sinton, p. 19.

"Nothing can prevent the destruction of civilization unless the commodities which now go into the possession of the landowners, under the names of rent, dividends, interest and profits, as unearned increment, are returned into the public treasury for the common use of all the people."—Ditto, p. 21.

"To sum up, then, it is obvious that when all land rent goes into the public treasury, when taxes are abolished and all land is opened up for use to the highest bidder, interest, dividends and profits will disappear and be absorbed in rent, owing to the competition for any and every kind of natural advantage. We see what a tremendous revolution the Land Values regime will bring. In fact the whole social system as we know it will disappear utterly and an era of voluntary cooperation in industry will be ushered in, allowing full scope for the individual while at the same time providing fully for the common needs of all."—Ditto, p. 27.

E. WYE.

# As to Interest: Reply to E. Wye

In the illustration of the little child going berry picking (Chap. II), E. Wye says: "Now, I could never see why the child's pinafore would not have sufficed, or if necessary its fist, save that the labor expended in bringing home the berries would have been less efficient." Exactly! And it was to obtain efficiency that a basket was sought and obtained. This basket was produced by labor, and labor is entitled to wages which it would have received had the basket been bought, or to interest (partial wages) as the basket was merely borrowed.

E. Wye continues: "If there was no monopoly in basets, then the use of baskets was the conventional way of gathering or producing berries." If the use of baskets were sufficiently "conventional" to be general among berry pickers, then every berry picker would have a baskethaving bought it. The fact that a basket is borrowed discloses both need and lack of baskets. Baskets for sale in a store that sells baskets is not necessarily an evidence of monopoly of baskets, and E. Wye will admit the equity in the storekeeper asking payment for his baskets. Would a stock of baskets in a store kept in stock to loan them as required be any more evidence of monopoly? And would payment for their temporary use, instead of purchase for permanent use, be any less equitable? There are stores that lend camp chairs for funerals and parties. Is the payment charged for these inequitable?

Similarly, water filters and coolers, gas stoves for apartment dwellings, towel racks for offices, and other articles of this nature, are loaned out for pay. The houses and apartments and offices and lofts that are rented are in themselves wealth hired out for pay. Is there anything wrong about that?

E. Wye says that putting berries in baskets is "an extension of the earlier mode of putting them in a big leaf for conveyance," but how does that affect the situation? If big leaves were not at hand, and one had to make a day's

journey to obtain such a leaf, would not the possessor of such a leaf be entitled to one day's berry pickings as payment for it, or to a small share of a day's pickings for the use of the leaf?

E. Wye asks: "Should our economist not also include the child's clothes as part of its tools, since they protect the child from briars during the operation of gathering?" If the clothes protect the child from the briars, then there is wear and tear on the clothes in the process of picking, and the clothes must be replaced. There would then naturally be special clothing used for the purpose of berry picking, and if some one had such clothing handy that fitted the child, and the loan of this clothing was asked, the purpose would be to save the child's other clothing, and as the lender could have legitimately come into the possession of such clothing only by producing them with his labor or purchasing them, which is the same thing in economics, he would be entitled to wages for the sale, or interest for the loan.

E. Wye's next sentence is rather surprising: "The fact is that without a monopoly or a patent right, tools become part and parcel of society's inheritance from the past." Isn't this rather socialistic? In what manner or by what process do tools become part and parcel of society's inheritance from the past? This implies social ownership of tools and the machinery of production.

It is true, as E. Wye further says, "Every advantage derivable from the growth of the arts in production, in invention and in the advances of scientific knowledge is absorbed in rent." But the rent having been paid by the labor that produced the "arts" and the "inventions," labor has become quit with society, and society having so absorbed its part in the "advances of scientific knowledge" leaves labor in the undisputable and equitable possession of the tools and machinery it has produced, with no further rightful claim on the part of society.

In the quotation from Lewis H. Berens' "Toward the Light," in Chap. II, the opening statement that "Nature yields more to labor when making use of tools than when working unaided" expresses the reason why labor seeks capital; while the closing statement of the quotation, "The essential thing which James loaned to William was not the privilege of applying his labor in a more effective way, but the use of the concrete result of ten days' labor," contains the justification for the payment of the use of capital—in this case partial wages for ten days' labor.

In Chap. III E. Wye's explanation of the "inevitability" of interest "under the existing system of private ownership of land" can apply only to the *rate* of interest, not to its equity. Naturally, lenders of capital, especially in the form of money, will not lend out at a lower rate than the "market." And as long as land monopoly furnishes a fruitful market they would be foolish to lend at any lower rate than they can obtain in land investments.

E. Wye himself senses this, for in the next two para-

graphs of Chap. III he shows clearly how the abolition of land monopoly will reduce the need for borrowed capital and abolish the fruitful money lenders' market. This is quite different from saying that interest *itself* arises out of and is based only on land monopoly.

The quotation from Lewis Berens' "Toward the Light," in Chap. III, does not well apply to the title E. Wye has chosen for his thesis, "As to Interest." It would apply had he chosen as his title "As to Henry George's Justification of Interest." Thus there is neither purpose nor profit in analyzing it.

Berens' analysis, however, is correct, and it completely justifies interest as payment for the loan of accumulated labor, or in other words, as partial wages.

In Chap. IV E. Wye says, "Capital in iteslf produces nothing." How would he reconcile this with his admission in the first paragraph of his second chapter that the basket produced efficiency? Or with the quotation from Lewis Berens in Chap. II that "Nature yields more to labor when making use of tools than when working unaided." Greater efficiency is all that has ever been claimed for capital by any of its economic opponents except Henry George, and George includes efficiency as one of capital's contributions to production.

E. Wye himself justifies interest as payment for tools and machinery (as wages for stored-up labor) in two beautiful sentences in Chap. IV: "Everything in the universe is of energy compounded, a machine being but an extension of human energy. The multiform modes of power that so distinguish modern invention are upon analysis all to be found acting within the human microcosm.

As to the claim that "the utmost that can be expected from the use of wealth is its maintenance or replacement," I should like to ask E. Wye whether the mere "replacement" of a "run-it-yourself" automoblie without payment for the use of capital would be sufficient payment for its use? Or whether the maintenance or replacement of a house, an apartment, a store or a loft is sufficient payment for its use?

There seems to be a contradiction in terms in the following question and answer quoted from Chap. IV which demonstrates the difficulty, even in a mind so keen as that of E. Wye, of establishing a clear and valid argument against the equity of true interest. Question: "Leaving aside what is called spurious capital, which is a compound of monopoly and special privilege, with a power to levy tribute in the shape of dividends, interest and profits, what is the 'interest' we are here concerned with and what is its origin?" (Note what the question means to "leave aside.") Answer: "It is a convention of modern times springing from poverty (lack of wealth) on the one hand and superabundance of unearned possessions on the other. Its beneficiaries are landlords, bankers and investors who in the current maldistribution of wealth find easy and willing clients in the millions of the poor." Thus the "compound of monopoly and special privilege with a power to levy tribute in the shape of dividends, interest and profits" after being set aside is dragged in again to define "the interest we are here concerned with and its origin."

Surely if *monopoly* interest is the *only* interest we are concerned with, we cannot find justification for *true* interest. Also the very fact that we are concerned only with *monopoly interest* prevents us from seeing or trying to see what *is true interest* and what is its origin.

In the quotations from Ernest Crosby's "Labor and Neighbor" (Chap. IV) monopoly interest is being considered, not natural interest. Its claim that "squirrels and bees save without receiving any bonus upon their savings, and men can doubtless acquire the same wisdom if they try," leaves out of consideration the fact that squirrels and bees use neither tools nor machinery. Also it doesn't argue that bonuses prove lack of wisdom. Its answer to its own admission that "men prefer to enjoy a thing now to postponing the enjoyment of it to the future, and hence that they will always pay a bonus for anticipating the use of it"-namely, the supposition that we may expect "the advent of a more philosophical frame of mind which will allow the trouble of preserving the desired thing to offset the annoyance of waiting for it"-is so visionary that it can hardly add to the clarity of an economic discussion.

The quotation from Lewis Berens' "Toward the Light" (Chap. IV) deals in pure speculation as to what capita will be worth to a borrower "under natural and equitable conditions." Assuming it will be worth comparatively little, what of it? That doesn't abolish capital nor invali date interest! Also assuming, as the quotation does, that the care of the capital and its safe return may, under the conditions stated, be worth as much or more to the lender as the use of the capital is to the borrower, and thus "honest and solvent borrowers be able to command premium for preserving the possessions of their fellows for future use." What of that? Would the fact that "A" sells "B" services, and "B" sells "A" services, nullify the value (or price) of either services? The value of the services may balance each other, or they may not, and the only way in which this can be determined is by setting these values against each other, but the services mus each have values for this to be determined.

Nor is there anything economically or philosophically valid in an argument which proceeds on the theory that because under certain conditions the value of a thin approaches zero, therefore the thing itself does not exist.

The quotation from Sir George Fowlds in the Aucklan Liberator (Chap. IV) opens with a gratuitous assumption. It is statements like this that lead well-meaning but hasty people to jump at conclusions and leave the saf road of sound economic reasoning.

Obviously what Fowlds had in mind when making the statement was the inordinate *rate* that money lender exact and which is *called interest*. It is this *rate* that ha its props in the "private appropriation of rent," and the

will "disappear with the public collection of rent." Not legitimate interest on legitimate capital. That is and always will remain payment for the use of "stored-up labor," and thus "wages."

The statement by Fowlds, as also the opening statement in the Berens quotation above referred to, that all wealth distintegrates and tends to go back to the earth from which it came, also bears only against the *rate* that true capital could command under equitable conditions. These tendencies of wealth to disintegrate and become completely valueless will govern the rate of interest exactly as it was intended in the Mosaic law of the Jubile: "According to the number of years after the Jubile thou shalt buy of thy neighbor, and according unto the number of years of the fruits he shall sell unto thee: According to the multitude of years thou shalt increase the price thereof, and according to the fewness of years thou shalt diminish the price of it: for according to the number of the years of the fruits doth he sell unto thee." (Leviticus xxv, 15 and 16.)

Here is a recognition of diminishing returns with diminishing value, or utility, and clearly it is a recognition (as there are many in this greatest of books) of the operation of natural law in the affairs of men.

The very expression by Fowlds of the "relationship between capital and labor" under equitable conditions that "the service which labor renders to capital by preserving it would be the equivalent of the services which capital renders to labor by increasing its productive power," assumes a value in the "services which capital renders to labor by increasing its productive power." That is all that the proponents of true interest claim for it. Whether that would be the "equivalent of the services which labor renders to capital by preserving it" has nothing at all to do with the matter under discussion, and the prediction that two values would be equal and an offset against each other is supposititious and irrelevant.

It is of course true, as Fowlds says in the same quotation, that "with rent collected and used for community purposes, all power of economic exploitation of man by his fellows would disappear," but that clearly is a question of rates or charges for services and not an indictment against the equity of those charges.

In Chap. V is not E. Wye resorting to the straw-man building and destroying practice we are all so familiar with? "Georgists" (and that term can be made to mean anything the user may wish it to mean) are not necessarily economists; and if they do choose to appropriate that title, then economists are not always fundamental or logical. How does it affect the question of capital and its function, and interest and its justification, what "Georgists are prone to belittle"—or to emphasize? And what is that "common garden variety of interest which the borrower pays to the money lender?"

If we are discussing economic factors and phases—especially if we are "Georgists"—why not adhere to eco-

nomic reasoning and define our terms so that we can all agree on their meanings? "Interest which the borrower pays to the money lender" is *not* true interest in the fundamental economic sense. It is a combination of monopoly rent (largely), tribute (very materially), and wages and true interest (partially), and is collectible only because of the dire need of the producer to get possession of the wealth (or capital) he needs in production and of which our private land owning and private rent collecting system has robbed him.

To indict this form of "interest" is not an indictment of *true* interest, and to make it appear that because this iniquitous charge which is called interest is wrong, therefore there is no charge for the use of capital is, to say the least, obscure argumentation.

And why cast aspersions on the "common man" when the uncommon has such difficulty in finding his way about?

The quotation in this chapter (V) from "The Story of Archimedes" by Mark Twain is refreshing. It sheds a little humor on the subject, even if it does not add much sustenance.

The quotations from "Natural Prosperity," by R. F. Dyson, are all indictments of what the money lender exacts for the use of the money he lends (monopoly interest) and do not bear in any way or degree against true interest.

The opening phrase of the first quotation discloses, however, the kind of economic reasoning that has been employed by Dyson in his contribution on interest: "a capitalist primarily lends money." Even a Socialist who has any regard for economic facts couldn't have said that. How are we as "fundamentalists" ever going to get anywhere with that kind of talk?

The second phrase of the first sentence of the same quotation, "and before he can lend it, it must be spare," Dyson got from Shaw. Yes, Bernard Shaw, none other! So listen to Shaw: "Land is not the only property that returns a rent to the owners. Spare money will do the same. Spare money is called capital." (Dyson's book, page 41.)

After quoting Shaw as above in his book "Natural Prosperity," Dyson says: "Shaw's definition, spare money, is the correct term for capital. Other people define capital as wealth which is used to produce more wealth, such as machinery, buildings, etc. A capitalist would therefore appear to be a man who owns a number of such things and draws interest through the loan thereof. It is argued from that definition of capital that because machinery, etc., aids production, the capitalist does also and is justly entitled to his interest. That is to confuse what is termed capital with the capitalist; and moreover it gives no clear idea of what a capitalist is or does." (Page 41.)

Then follows Dyson's definition of a capitalist as quoted by E. Wye. If the definition indicted by Dyson causes confusion, as he says it does, what is to be said of Dyson's "clarification"? The definition he quotes is, of course, not a complete justification of interest, but it is a correct statement as far as Dyson stated it. Note the cavalier manner in which he brushes it aside and substitutes for it the oracular pronouncements of G. B. S.!

Not to bore the reader, or to fill the pages of this paper with a talk on interest or to try the patience of the editor who sits on high in this discussion as the wise old owl who "seeth much but sayeth little," we will not attempt a complete review of Dyson's chapters on interest in "Natural Prosperity" as we had originally set out to do, but a few quotations may aid in disclosing the kind of argumentation that is employed in the premises.

"Land bears a rent for natural reasons, as we have previously shown; rent generally increases with the lapse of time because the community grows. Wealth does not bear a natural rental value like land; land and wealth are two distinct things." (Page 42.) Dyson uses this distinction to show that wealth is not entitled to a natural return. He, of course, loses sight of the fact that nature is manysided and that there are other natural laws that operate. There are other laws in the economic world than the Law of Rent. Space forbids us to go into the latter in detail here. Perhaps at some future date the writer will do so. The trouble at the basis of all this controversy over interest is that those who do not agree with Henry George's justification of it, seek no further for justification but condemn the entire structure without applying the light of correct fundamental economic reasoning.

Wealth may not, as Dyson correctly says, "bear a natural rental value like land," which depends only on the presence and activities of the community, but it does bear within itself a basis of value just as sacred—the value of the labor that produced it, and its earnings (interest) is as fully justified by that equally natural return to labor, wages, as land is to rent. The need for capital and the willingness of producers to pay for it are just as natural, though not as immediate, as his need and demand for land; and the justification of interest is just as economically sound as the communal ownership of rent.

On page 44 Dyson says: "Spare money bears interest only when another borrows it. If the producer borrows one hundred pounds and pays back one hundred and fifty pounds, the extra fifty pounds must obviously be a deduction from his earnings. The only part played by the lender was to hand over a check and take documents as security. He would receive ample compensation for his exertion in receiving back his one hundred pounds at a future date; for he would thereby save his depreciation bill which the ownership of any wealth naturally entails. The extra fifty pounds he would receive as a reward for inertia. Inertia produces nothing, and the extra amount would be purely unearned increment." The opening sentence is, of course, obvious and unnecessary. Nothing has a value unless some one wants it. Land has no value unless some one wants it. The example of 50 per cent interest being paid is, of course, used to make the transaction look usurious and can be discounted. Also the illustration carries out Dyson's and Shaw's insistence that a

capitalist is only a money lender. So these attitudes will have to be resolved in the mind of the reader. But to analyze: The part played by the lender, as Dyson states it, is indeed rather insignificant, but how about his having come into the possession of one hundred pounds, or one hundred pounds of wealth, or capital? Under equitable conditions he had to perform services for it if he came by it honestly. Is he not entitled to payment for those services?

"The lender would receive ample compensation for his exertion in receiving back his one hundred pounds at a future date; for he would thereby save his depreciation bill which wealth naturally entails," says Dyson.

Is that why borrowers are willing to pay for wealth—because it depreciates? Or is it because it assists them in production? And if it has such a value to them, why hasn't it a value to the lender? If it had not, who would produce wealth beyond his immediate needs? And then where would capital come from?

The fact that the borrower borrowed one hundred pounds and paid back one hundred and fifty, troubles Dyson. It is his own fault. Had he not put up the interest so high he would not have felt so bad. Dyson does not say how much the borrower made with the use of one hundred pounds—perhaps he doubled the money and thus was fifty pounds to the good. Also Dyson does not say what a "life saver" that one hundred pounds was just in the nick of time when, if he didn't have it, the borrower would have had to set about first earning and saving that one hundred pounds.

Also what assurance has Dyson of that "depreciation' of wealth that the proponents of his proposition content for and which should make the lender happy to receive his wealth back intact? Hasn't he ever heard of wealth appreciation, especially the wealth he and Shaw speak o—"money"? It would seem that the lessons of history would give them pause and make them reconsider.

On page 46 occurs this: "When rent fluctuates in rea estate business it is the ground or land rent which moves not the usury charged for the use of the building. The two are separate and distinct, although they are commonly spoken of under one head—rent." This will be great news to the followers of Henry George! The charge for the use of a building is usury!

Some economic sustenance, too, may be gathered from this: "There are many ramifications of the business calculating usury, for the 'capitalistic' system is simple a pawnbroking system." (Page 48.)

This writer holds no briefs for the monopoly interests but to characterize the system of *private ownership an control of capital* as a "pawnbroking system" is just muc dleheadedness.

And here is some economic dicta. "The simple facts that wealth can be produced only by applied human exertion and that wealth or its equivalent in money divorced from labor does not increase in value but must decrease, are i

themselves sufficient proof that interest is unnatural and therefore unjust and a robbery of producers, earnings." (Page 51.)

"Wealth can be produced only by applied human exertion," says Dyson. Yet in the succeeding phrase he assumes the possibility of wealth being "divorced from labor." Labor may or may not use it, but how can you divorce wealth from the labor that is in it from the labor that created it-from the "human exertion" that, as the quotation admits, is the "only" thing that "produced" it? Of course, Dyson didn't mean that labor; he meant the labor that would have to make use of this stored-up labor in order to give it a value. He loses sight of the creative labor in the wealth; he loses sight of the fact that if "wealth can be produced only by applied human exertion," wealth represents that "human exertion," and that wealth is thus merely stored-up human exertion, stored-up labor, and that this is the natural and basic justification for a return to such stored-up labor or the "wages" of capital-interest.

The claim that wealth does not increase in value has already been answered elsewhere in this criticism, but what if it does or does not increase in value? That has nothing to do with the argument. You might just as well say that wealth does or does not float on water. It does or it doesn't, but so far as its justification for a return is concerned it is responsive to other natural laws. Let those who would write about interest and wealth learn something about these other natural laws.

Now back to E. Wye: The quotations from "Radicalia" by S. Tideman add nothing to the argument. They address themselves definitely to our present monopoly and tribute-exacting system, and end with the acknowledgment that "no law can circumvent it as long as the rental value of land is treated as private property," which is true.

The quotations from "The Fundamental Principles of Economics" (Charles J. Townsend and Walter L. Sinton) apply mainly to present monopoly conditions and the necessary remedy. In the final quotation, however, the authors are guilty of that most unforgivable of sins, an non sequitur: "It is obvious that when all land rent goes into the public treasury, when taxes are abolished and all land is opened up for use to the highest bidder, interest, dividends and profits will disappear and be absorbed in tent, owing to the competition for any and every kind of natural advantage." How does it follow that community use of rent will abolish "interest, dividends and profits?" Rent is paid because "these" are earned, and after they are earned. Not before. How can it absorb them? The writers give as the circumstance that will cause this ecoiomically impossible eventuality to happen "the competiion for any and every kind of natural advantage." Competition for natural advantages carries with it competition or the facilities that will enable the competitors to derive he greatest returns from those "natural advantages," and as "nature yields more to labor when making use of ools than when working unaided" (already quoted), and

"labor expended in bringing home the berries" without baskets "would have been less efficient" (E. Wye's own statement), we can visualize the competitors for "natural advantages" also being competitors for the tools and machinery, for the organization and efficiency, that will more quickly translate the advantages into rewards. These tools and machinery are capital (stored-up labor), and in the competition for possession of this capital will arise willingness, indeed desire, to pay for this capital, and this return to capital will be payment for stored-up labor—interest.

If labor is entitled to wages, it is entitled to those wages whether it works for hire or whether it works for itself. In the former case it is handed its share by the employer; in the latter case it keeps the product. The product, too, is labor—labor in concrete form; stored-up labor. The producer has a right to sell it; the return he gets is another form of wages. If the product happens to be a tool, and its nature, or the circumstances, make the loan rather than the sale of the tool advantageous or necessary, does the labor in the tool thereby disappear? If it does not, is the laborer or producer not entitled to wages for that labor, to payment for the use of the tool? The answer seems obvious. Whether it is a tool or a complicated machine, what is the difference? Its helpfulness to others makes its possession desirable and profitable. It cannot be reproduced except by the expenditure of a like amount of labor as that already put into it; such labor would have to be exerted or paid for if the tool or machine had to be made. Why isn't the labor already stored up in the machine, which has the added advantage of having already been expended and therefore now saving time (the time of reproducing it), entitled to its hire? If the machine were to be bought it would have to be paid for? Would that be inequitable? If not, why is the partial payment for its use considered inequitable?

We must learn to distinguish between natural and unnatural conditions, between health and disease. We must learn to seek causes and not take the apparent for the real.

Our social evils are due to violations of natural law; they are as pathological as the acts of a mind deranged and as unreliable in determining normal conditions.

The sun doesn't move in its relation to the earth even if it does seem to do so.

The disparagement of capital as a factor in production, even though it plays the minor part, or the attempt to invalidate interest because under the abnormal and unnatural condition in which we live, monopoly, usury, tribute and other legalized robbery is *called* interest, is like condemning the character of a man in health because of his acts in a fever delirium. It is like saying the earth is flat and all the universe revolves about it.

It is jumping at conclusions without seeking causes.

OSCAR H. GEIGER.

# Henry George School of Social Science

SINCE our last issue, which announced the classes and forums of the School of Social Science as being conducted at the Youth House, a change of location was found advisable. The young folks that are attracted to the Youth House are more of the fun-loving type seeking diversion and pleasure than the studious or even serious type to which the School necessarily makes its appeal.

The classes are now held at the Pythian Temple, 135 West 70th Street, just east of Broadway, perhaps one of the finest assembly room locations in New York, and are meeting with marked success, both in attendance and in the interest manifested.

Starting with an attendance of about twenty-five, half of whom were adults and largely convinced, and half high school students just initiated and merely curious, the classes now average more than fifty, of whom about forty are college and high school students, and some teachers, all interested and most of them taking part in the discussions that follow the lectures.

Walter Fairchild, a college man himself, who carries the message of Henry George to colleges and universities at every possible opportunity, and who attended one of the classes, writes:

"I was much interested and encouraged upon my visit to your class last night, in connection with the Henry George School of Social Science, which you are directing. I am sure your plan is a good one, and will succeed with perseverance and a lot of hard work, which I know you will give it. My observation is that you are planning your talks in classroom style, which I think is correct. \* \* \* I hope your plan will work out so that you may be able to have a definite room for your class work. \* \* \* I believe in the teaching method as against the oratorical method, although both have their place according to the opportunity offered. I am writing this in a personal vein, giving my thoughts as they occur for what they may be worth. With personal regards and best wishes for your success."

Coming from a man of Mr. Fairchild's learning and vision, these are precious words. The letter also contained words of good counsel and valuable advice which, even more than the words of praise, are evidence of sincerity and constructive assistance. Such interest and moral support call forth one's best efforts and are an urge to better and bigger accomplishments.

A luncheon meeting of the Advisory Committee was called to meet at Halz's restaurant, Woolworth Building, on April 15, which was attended by all in and near New York who could spare the time (one good soul, Gilbert M. Tucker, Jr., coming down from Albany to be present). Many kind words of regret were received from those too distant to attend.

At this meeting steps were taken toward organization and incorporation. Professor John Dewey accepted the position of honorary president of the School, and the Hon. Frederic C. Howe was elected as chairman of the Advisory Committee. The board of trustees elected were Frederic Cyrus Leubuscher, president; Anna George de Mille, vice-president; Joseph Dana Miller, treasurer; Harold Benedict, general secretary; William Ryan, recording secretary.

It was also decided at this meeting to send out a general appeal for funds to support the work of the School, and this, together with additional descriptive matter, was mailed under date of May 14. If there are readers of this article who have not received such matter and who are interested in the work of the School, it will be mailed to them immediately on receipt of their request.

We are pleased not only to be able to report progress in the work of the School in its regular Pythian Temple classes and forums, but we are also happy to report that as a result of Mr. Geiger's lectures outside of the School a new forum class has been started under Mr. Geiger's direction which meets every Tuesday night at the Young Israel Synagogue, 229 East Broadway, in the section of Manhattan Island known as the "Lower East Side." Those organizing it as a result of hearing Mr. Geiger speak are of high calibre, and mostly well educated young folks: college students, several college graduates, a few teachers. Mr. Geiger is very much gratified with the results of the few meetings that have been held and is greatly encouraged by the unusual interest shown.

Mr. Geiger seems determined to make the School a United Movement Effort rather than a "one-man institution," for, while he conducts the classes, unless another speaker capable of doing this is at hand, his endeavor is to have a different lecturer at every meeting if possible, the purpose being two-fold: first, it gives the students an opportunity to see and hear the various men and women in the movement and thus to know that there is a movement, this permitting them to hear the subject presented from different angles and view-points and helping to hold their interest; second, that this will rekindle the spirit that has cooled because of inaction, and give followers of Henry George an opportunity to do work they can and want to do.

Thus far the responses have been all that could be wished for. Bolton Hall, Whidden Graham, Benjamin W. Burger and Morris Van Veen have already spoken and are willing to speak as often as called upon. Anna George de Mille, who has already dedicated herself to the School, lends lustre and inspiration to the work by her presence at the classes, while Isabel Colbron, James F. Morton and Joseph H. Fink have signified their willingness to speak.

Owing to the great amount of detail work that Mr Geiger has had to do in the organizing of the School assisted only by Mrs. Geiger, who, to her eternal credi be it said, has taken up typing in order to be able to assist in secretarial work and thus save expense, Mr. Geiger has had to defer for a while his outside lecture work. With the assistance now of the faithful souls that have volunteered their services to speak as occasion calls and their time permits, he means to more actively resume this work and hopes to provide opportunity for everyone willing to help the Cause.

Later on, we understand, Mr. Geiger will write to all who have ever done lecture work and ask their active assistance. We believe it would be gracious of them to accept the offer if they can. In fact, a voluntary offer on their part in advance of such request would, we believe, prove a fitting reward for Mr. Geiger's efforts and an encouragement in the tasks before him.

We asked Mr. Geiger to tell us for publication in a few words how he felt about the success of the School. This is what he wrote:

"All things are comparative. This is as true of success as it is of everything else. When we speak of the success the School is having we do not 'point with pride'; rather we are gratified that we have chosen the right path and that we are going in the right direction. There is much more to be done, higher goals to be achieved, greater tasks to be accomplished.

"We can take only one step at a time. We now have a School; our next step is to have our own schoolroom, our own meeting place, our own headquarters, where, if necessary, we can conduct classes every night, and if it should be required for those who cannot attend at night, have classes during the day.

"We believe this will be made possible by the responses to our appeal just issued. We hope we will be able to report success in this direction before the next issue of LAND AND FEREDOM."

May we add that editorial blessings go with this programme. What an achievement it would be if our movement could point to the Henry George School of Social Science open every day and every evening, with classes teaching the Philosophy of Henry George, and open at all times to all who would hear the message!

To a Georgian, it fires the imagination and grips the heart.

Several requests have been received (one from a Single Tax lecturer) asking that a Question and Answer column be conducted by LAND AND FREEDOM. The need for such a department seems evident, and the Henry George School of Social Science section of this magazine, is, perhaps, the logical place for such a feature.

An attempt will be made by the editor or Mr. Geiger to answer all serious questions on Economic and Social Philosophy as these are viewed in accordance with fundamental Georgian principles. Space, however, forbids long argumentation and it is therefore requested that questions be clear and brief. Also questions should bear the name

and address of the questioner, in the event that correspondence on the subject may be necessary.

This is a good opportunity to interest the young folks everywhere and should prove a worthy and useful extension of the services of the School.

# Manhattan S. T. Club Activities

HEREWITH is a report of the work of the Manhattan Single Tax Club covering the period since our report in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

We have found it necessary to reduce our activities because of shortage of funds, and regret that among the other curtailments it was necessary to discontinue the Ingersoll speaking tour after three months of strenuous cross-country campaigning.

Mr. Ingersoll delivered 127 separate lectures, his audiences numbering 20,714, and has been successful in securing much front-page newspaper publicity. We regret we cannot arrange for a return tour by Mr. Ingersoll, but our treasury is entirely depleted.

We are receiving many requests for literature, but are running short of printed matter. We have had edited, ready for printing, four unpublished lectures by Mr. James R. Brown, our late President. It has been suggested that these lectures be printed in book form. This would be a very useful work and a memorial to Mr. Brown.

Mention was made in March-April issue of the lecture trip of our secretary, Mr. Fairchild, but the lectures were not listed. Mr. Fairchild spoke at some important colleges on this trip, and it will be of interest to your readers to know that the schools in the South at which Mr. Brown was a regular visitor have not been neglected this year.

Mr. Fairchild started for Baltimore Sunday, March 6, and met Mr. Spencer Heath of Elkridge, Md., at his home that evening. Mr. Heath accompanied Mr. Fairchild on the trip. Mr. Fairchild spoke as follows:

March 7—Baltimore, Md.; Johns Hopkins University at 8:30 a.m.; 40 in attendance in Prof. Broadus Mitchell's class in economics.

College Park; University of Maryland, at 1:20 p. m.; group of 20 students in economics; Prof. W. H. Brown in charge. At 6:30, to Johns Hopkins for an advanced class in economic history; fine group of 35; talk lasted one hour and thirty minutes.

March 8—Westminster, Md.; Western Maryland College; 60 stusents in assembly; introduced by Dr. Frank B. Hurt (Prof. Hurt was formerly at the University of Virginia and is a friend of Prof. Snavely); after the class, Mr. Fairchild and Mr. Heath had a discussion with Prof. Hurt and Prof. E. K. Schempp, who took an opposite view, but was very friendly.

March 9—Annapolis, Md.; St. John's College; 40 mature students; introduced by Dr. J. W. Wyckoff; also met Prof. J. A. Duncan, associated with Dr. Wyckoff in the economics department.

Washington, D. C.; George Washington University at 6:00 p. m.; Dr. Joseph S. Zucker's class in public finance; 40 students in number; Howard University at 7:30 p. m., Economics Club; George Butler president; 25 present; introduced by Ralph J. Bunche; meeting adjourned 9:00 p. m.

March 10—Richmond, Va.; University of Richmond; Prof. Seay's class in economics, 10:00 a. m., 75 present; Prof. Thomas' class at 11 a. m., 60 present; Prof. Seay's class at 12:00 noon, 30 present.

March 11—Williamsburg, Va.; College of William and Mary; at 10:00 a. m. spoke to class of advanced students in economics, 80 in number; gave straight talk on Henry George Single Tax, based on "Progress and Poverty." At 12, talked to class in socialism and social problems; 25 students; talk based on "Progress and Poverty" from viewpoint of social problems and relation of individual to society, on lines of "Is It to Be Socialism, Anarchism or Freedom?" as worked out by Mr. Brown; met Profs. Taylor, Marsh, Corey, Southworth, Gibbs, of the department of economics; all very cordial.

In all schools Mr. Fairchild recommended use of "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty" for class work. He advised professors that copies could be obtained from the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation at small cost.

Mr. Ingersoll's lectures in California continued as follows after the March 3 date printed in the March-April LAND AND FREEDOM:

March 4-La Jolla; Kiwanis Club; 75 present.

San Diego; Army and Navy Y. M. C. A.; Henry George Club banquet; 50 present.

March 5-Glendale; meeting at home of Mrs. L. I. Robinson.

March 6—Santa Monica; People's Forum; 150 present; almost four hours of discussion.

March 7-Bakersfield; Kiwanis Club; 90 present.

March 8—Bakersfield; Kern County High School and College; combined classes in assembly; 125 in attendance; Labor Temple at 8 p. m.; 60 present.

March 9—Bakersfield; High School; class of 125, one hour talk; class of 90, one hour talk.

March 10—Hollywood; meeting of Hollywood Society Folk in Laungley's Studio, 8:30 p. m.; arranged by Mr. Charles James; 100 present; 20-minute talk and quiz.

March 11-Los Angeles; Westlake Park Forum; 25 present.

March 13-Los Angeles; First Unitarian Church; 20 present.

March 14—Bakersfield; Social Service Class; 18 boys and girls; half-hour talk and one-hour quiz.

Fresno; High School Forum; 100 present, double usual attendance.

March 15—Berkeley; Armstrong College of Business Administration, School of Commerce; 350 students.

March 16—Modesto; Kiwanis Club; combined meeting of all clubs in town, including realtors; 225 in audience.

March 17—Daly City; Jefferson Union High School assembly; 800 present; 25-minute talk and half-hour quiz.

March 18—Stockton; High School; 300 economics students; Advertising Club at noon; good talk and one-hour of quiz; 60 present; College of Pacific; 25 students in economics class; 25-minute talk and good question period; Forum at City Hall Auditorium; 40 present; arranged by Mr. Beckwith; 7:30 to 10:00 p. m., including one hour of questions.

March 20—Pacific Grove; California M. E. Church pulpit for nice talk, followed by a question period of one hour; 300 present.

March 21—Monterey; Lions Club; 50 present; talk followed by one-hour question period.

March 22—Palo Alto; Kiwanis Club; 45 present; arranged by Judge Ralston; Community House Meeting.

March 23—Mills College P. O.; Mills College, 8:00 a. m.; class in economics; 35 girls.

Oakland; Exchange Club; 80 present.

Berkeley; Pacific Grove Social Crusade, evening; 60 present; task followed by two-hour quiz.

March 24—Vallejo; Rotary Club; 12:15 noon to 2:30 p. m.; 75 present; title of address, "Business Depression—Cause and Cure;" Red Cross meeting; 30-minute talk; 40 present.

March 25—Oakland; North Oakland Kiwanis Cub; 60 present; title of address, "Taxation and Business."

March 28—Eureka; Rotary Club; 200 present, including mayor, assessors, collector, all of Council, two editors; overran 30 minutes and two-thirds remained until 2:30 for quiz; Lions Sciot (Masonic) and Realtors; 75 present.

Arcata; combined Kiwanis Clubs of Arcata, Crescent City, etc.; one-hour talk and quiz; 100 present.

Mr. Oscar H. Geiger delivered the following lectures since the last report:

April 3—Hollis, L. I.; home of Mr. and Mrs. Lauinger; meeting arranged by Mr. L. T. Recker, a rather recent convert to the Single Tax; 35 young men and women present.

April 17-New York, N. Y.; the Vagabonds' Literary and Discussion Club; title of address, "Henry George and His Single Tax Idea;" 75 present.

MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB (Beatrice Cohen, Assistant Secretary).

We may state that Mr. Charles H. Ingersoll early in May started on an independent lecture tour in Oregon, his first address being before the Knights of the Round Table at Portland, Ore., where he was introduced by Mr. S. Uren. The meeting was arranged by Mrs. Max Lorenz. His personel itinerary follows:

May 4—Rotary Club, Salem, Ore.; noon meeting; economics class (Prof. Metz), University of Oregon at Eugene; Junior Chamber of Commerce, Eugene.

May 5—Albany; combined meeting of Service Clubs, Advertising Kiwanis, etc.; noon meeting; afternoon, economics class Oregon State College, Corvallis; Oregon Evening, Fraternity House, Oregon State College.

May6—Reed College, Portland; economics class, 50 present (Prof Clement Akerman), 8 a. m.; 11:15, Oregan Institute of Technology Portland; 200 present; Harry Stone made arrangements for meeting

May 8—Portland Forum at Y. M C. A.; 3:30 p. m. Harry Ston made arrangements for meeting; 100 present.

In the present depression the world is acting much like a strong swimmer in a heavy surf, who exhausts his energies in a frantic effort to swim shoreward against the dreaded undertow, that current of water underneath which flows seaward. No more water is flowing seaward under neath than is flowing shoreward on the surface and rolling up the beach, and all he has to do is to keep his body and legs out of the lower current to be carried to the shore but he does not know this.—Stephen Bell in Commercand Finance.

EVERYTHING that goes up must come down, say the old maxim. Everything except taxes.—Seath (Wash.) Star.

# The Henry George Lecture Assn.

(United with the Henry George Foundation of America) 538 South Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE, Director and Treasurer STAFF SPEAKERS

WILLIAM N. McNair, Bakewell Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. CLAUDE L. WATSON, 538 South Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill. PROF. HARRY GUNNISON BROWN, 403 Garth St., Columbia, Mo. PERCY R. WILLIAMS, 1310 Berger Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. HON. GEORGE H. DUNCAN, East Jaffrey, N. H. MRS. ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE, 17 East 67th St., New York City.

#### LOCAL SPEAKERS

CHARLES G. BALDWIN, Munsey Building, Baltimore, Md. L. D. BECKWITH, Stockton, Calif.

HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Cincinnati, O. WILLIAM A. BLACK, San Antonio, Tex.

А. A. Booth, Seaboard Building, Seattle, Wash.

J. D. BRYANT, Albany, Ore.

JOHN S. CODMAN, 20 East St., Boston, Mass.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON, New Canaan, Conn.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON, Pender Island, B. C.

FREDERIC C. Howe, Harmon-on-the-Hudson, N. Y.

JAMES P. KOHLER, Congers, N. Y.

FRANK STEPHENS, Arden, Del.

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL, 341 Park St., East Orange, N. J.

WILLIAM MATTHEWS, Spokane, Wash.

RAY ROBSON, 608 Chestnut St., Lansing, Mich.

MISS EDITH SEEKEL, 626 Ethel Ave., Grand Rapids, Mich.

ABE D. WALDAUER, Bank of Commerce Building, Memphis, Tenn.

EDWARD WHITE, Kansas City, Mo.

Chicago, Ill.:

HENRY HARDINGE. WILLIAM H. HOLLY.

THOMAS A. MYER.

THOMAS R. WIER.

Character M. Caracteria

George M. Strachan.

HENRY L. T. TIDEMAN.

CLAYTON J. EWING.

New York City: MAX BERKOWITZ.

B. W. BURGER.

BOLTON HALL.

GEORGE LLOYD.

Morris Van Veen.

NEWS OF SINGLE TAX SPEAKERS

Single Taxers are finding themselves in greater demand than ever before to explain the philosophy and programme which they espouse. The lecture platform, the dining table and the radio are being placed at the disposal of Georgists in every part of the country. Now that many of the palliatives have been voiced and found wanting, pasic remedies are being considered. The following is a prief summary of the speaking activities of several noted bingle Taxers:

Claude L. Watson, Chicago, Ill.—From March 26 to May 6 Mr. Watson spoke to forty audiences, in twenty cities, in six States, and before nore than twenty-five different kinds of organizations. A conservative estimate is that he addressed over 2,500 persons and talked intinately with several hundred. Carried on under the auspices of the lenry George Lecture Association, Mr. Watson's month's work has telped to strengthen three Henry George Clubs and has prepared he way for the organizing of five or six more. Mr. Watson writes: 'Perhaps my views are somewhat biased by my close contact with my sudiences while they were in a receptive mood, but I have finished his month's lecture work more enthused over the outlook for the uture than ever before. Now is the time to put the Single Tax before

the public. Others with whom I have talked feel the same way about it "

William N. McNair, Pittsburgh, Pa .- About ten months ago Mr. McNair began a series of talks on "Economic Rent" in Wilkins Township, Allegheny County, just outside of Pittsburgh. The audiences at first numbered from 50 to 150. Active local leadership was soon developed, with the result that the meetings spread to the four neighboring communities of Turtle Creek, Wilkinsburg, North Versailles Township and Forest Hills. One of the groups consisted of Italians whose knowledge of economic rent had to be obtained from Mr. McNair through an interpreter! With meetings held in each section once or twice a month, a rally meeting for the whole section was arranged once every two months. As high as a thousand people were at the rallies. On April 16 a pre-election rally was held, at which Congressman Clyde Kelly and fifteen candidates for the Legislature spoke. Mr. Kelly came out emphatically for the full collection of economic rent. It was an excellent speech, enthusiastically received. Several candidates for the Legislature endorsed the extension of the Pittsburgh Plan to the rest of the county. Among the most prominent local leaders of the movement in Wilkins Township are B. H. Goodwin, an incisive and powerful speaker, whose business connections are with the Westinghouse Electric Company; Andrew A. McKeever, tax collector of Wilkins Township, and John S. Helmer, school director of Wilkins Township. Since the primaries, requests have come from a number of new localities to start classes. In addition to this activity Mr. McNair is addressing forums and clubs every week, and he is now planning a series of talks to be made in principal cities prior to the Democratic Convention in Chicago, at which he will be a delegate.

Peter Witt, Cleveland, O.—Though he holds no public office, there can be little question that Peter Witt is Cleveland's First Citizen. Since the time in the early Tom L. Johnson days, when he challenged Johnson at a political meeting, the name of Peter Witt has come to be the symbol of courage, honesty and principle in the minds and hearts of his fellow citizens. Every fall for fifteen years thousands of Clevelanders have paid a dollar or more a seat to attend "Peter Witt's Town Meeting" and to hear his resonant voice blaze out against hypocrisy, injustice and the meannesses of our political and social system. Saturday, May 7, Mr. Witt addressed the Cleveland City Club on "The Depression: Its Causes and Cures."

J. Edward Jones, Chicago, Ill.—Among recent addresses Mr. Jones has made under the auspices of the Henry George Lecture Association were those before the St. Charles, Ill., Kiwanis Club on April 26, and at the Henry George dinner held in Cincinnati, O., April 30.

George M. Strachan, Chicago, Ill.—On April 26 Mr. Strachan addressed the West Side Kiwanis Club, Chicago, at noon, and the North Chicago, Illinois, Rotary Club, in the evening. Few men have such a faculty for making converts to the Single Tax cause as Mr. Strachan.

Dr. Mark Millikin, Hamilton, O.—Dr. Millikin filled the following engagements with great success: Dayton, O., Kiwanis Club, March 1; the Veterans' Apothecaries Association March 15, and the Business Men's Association of Hillsboro, O., on April 4.

L. D. Beckwith, Stockton, Calif.—As the result of the widening influence of his two papers, The Forum and No Taxes, and of numerous talks before local groups, Mr. Beckwith reports that "the local walls of Jericho are slowly crumbling. I spoke at the Farm Bureau circle last week—at Farmington." Plans are being laid to arrange engagements for Mr. Beckwith on his trip to and from the Memphis Henry George Congress in October. His itinerary will include Southern Wisconsin. Invitations for him to speak may be sent to Mr. Beckwith direct, 1325 East Poplar Street, Stockton, Calif. The Henry George Foundation and the Henry George Lecture Association are cooperating in securing appointments.

#### NEWS OF HENRY GEORGE AND S. T. CLUBS

Cincinnati, O., Henry George Club—Thirty-five members are enrolled in the Henry George Club of Cincinnati, with Mr. Oscar A. Toepfert serving as acting secretary. Eleven of these are converts to the movement. A large part of the enrollment was secured at the Cincinnati Henry George dinner, April 30, at which J. Edward Jones of Chicago was the principal speaker.

Cleveland, O., Henry George Club—The first thirteen members enrolled in the Henry George Club of Cleveland are names notable in the Single Tax movement: Peter Witt, John C. Lincoln, David Gibson, Edward W. Doty, Howard M. Holmes, Mr. and Mrs. Horace Carr, Mr. and Mrs. William E. Parker, Mr. and Mrs. Edward A. Hach and Mr. and Mrs. Christian Girl. A Cleveland Henry George dinner was held Saturday, May 14.

Dayton, O., Henry George Club—Mr. Watson's visit to Dayton last month created such interest that a Henry George Club is being formed under the leadership of Mr. Walter J. H. Schutz, able Georgist and real estate operator, who believes more in home ownership than in lot speculation. First members of the club include John F. Morrisey and his son, Edward J. Morrisey; Mrs. Alice Kile Neibel, secretary of the old Dayton Single Tax Club, and Samuel Gingrich.

Grand Rapids, Mich., Henry George Club—Tying the Henry George Club of Cincinnati for membership, Herman Friedrick of Grand Rapids reports thirty-five enrolled members in his city's club. He writes: "At last the ice is broken! Mr. Watson's appearance in Grand Rapids was instrumental in accomplishing the results we were looking for. Although we had some names on the membership list of the Henry George Club, last week we picked up a number of additional names."

Indianapolis, Ind., Henry George Club—Enrolling as the first members of the Henry George Club of Indianapolis, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Stine write: "We are very glad to enroll in the Indianapolis Henry George Club. It was just such times as these that inspired the idea in Henry George, if we are not mistaken, and just now the people should be most receptive to it."

Lansing, Mich., Henry George Club-An illustrated front page story in the Lansing Capital News tells us that a delegation from the Henry George Club of Lansing went before Gov. Wilber M. Brucker on March 10 with resolutions asking that the Single Tax be included in the call for the special tax reform session of the State Legislature. The committee from the club consisted of Ray Robson, the club president; Mrs. Robson, Mrs. G. W. Ashworth, president of the Ingham County League of Women Voters, and Mrs. R. C. Spencer, vice-chairman of the Ingham County Republican Committee and a delegate to the Republican convention at Chicago. Two weeks after the call upon Gov. Brucker, the Lansing Capital News carried a two-column report of an interview with Mr. Robson on the plans and purposes of the Henry George Club. In the course of this interview Mr. Robson said: "No one but the Single Taxer seems to think it possible to do more than relieve in a slight degree the conditions that now exist-conditions that are expected to recur every few years. We don't share this hopeless attitude. We believe in the abolition of depression by means of the Single Tax."

Omaha, Neb., Henry George Club—At the third meeting of the season for the Omaha Club, Dr. T. T. Young, of Fremont, was the principal speaker. Arrangements are now being made by the club for addresses by Mr. Watson in the Omaha vicinity during his visit there the last week in May and early in June.

Peoria, Ill., Henry George Club—"The Stroller," editorial writer on the Peoria Star, begins his column in one issue in March with: "The social thought of Henry George has come to Peoria, judging

from the comment one hears on the streets. The proponents of the philosophy of the great Single Taxer have risen and intend to be heard, judging by the enthusiastic comment one hears in hotel lobbies, in clubs and almost everywhere one strolls. There is now a Peoria Henry George Club, with a throat specialist and an executive of a creamery heading the list. Men from all walks of life, disgruntled at the tax situation, have taken increased interest in the Henry George theories. The club plans to be active, its members state. There will be addresses, in order to acquaint the general public with their aims and ideals, by men of high talent."

Pillsburgh, Pa., Henry George Club—Charging it is a crime not to tax land values, and decrying the holding of idle land speculatively, John S. Helmer, Wilkins Township school director, predicted that valuable areas would be put to use for agriculture, factory or home sites if assessed and taxed properly, in a talk before the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh, Friday, May 6. "Instead of floating bond issues to relieve depression burdens, I recommend that the State and Federal governments levy land taxes," the school leader said. Later the club unanimously approved a resolution asking that a land tax be recommended by Governor Pinchot to the Legislature.

Portsmouth, N. H., Land Value Tax Association—From William Craig, president of the Portsmouth Land Value Tax Association, we learn of an aggressive local programme being carried out to bring Henry George's proposals before the people of his city. He writes: "We are limiting our efforts to this town as the cost of placing the matter before the State would be too great for us to bear at present. Our missionary work is bearing fruit and we hope to keep on till there is a sufficient number at least thinking about taxation and its results, before taking concrete action." More power to this fine spirited group!

Seattle, Wash., Opportunity-to-Make-a-Living League—This league is a definite movement to so change the tax law of the State of Washington that all ground rent shall go to the public treasury. So states its leader, Donald Bradford, old-guard Georgist. "We hold that no legislative assembly or constitutional convention ever had the moral or legal right to delegate to any individual or corporation the power to collect and appropriate rent for the use of any land, anywhere. Non has the community any right, moral or otherwise, to take by taxation that which is created by labor," reads one of the league's statements A large enrollment and sale of Henry George pamphlets is anticipated

South Bend, Ind., Henry George Club—As the result of Mr. Watson's speaking in South Bend during the last week in April, many new friends and members of the club were enlisted.

Victoria, B. C., Canada, Henry George Club—F. P. Rand, the G. O. G (Grand Old Georgist) of Victoria, writes: "I think we can organize a Henry George Club here in Victoria and could use about twenty five of the enrollment cards." You can be sure Mr. Rand received the cards, and that it won't be long before he has them all signed up with members! Despite the fact that Mr. Rand was in the hospital for seven weeks early in the year, he is now "out and about as usual."

#### HENRY GEORGE DINNERS

Cincinnati, O., Saturday evening, April 30—Rev. Louis G. Hoech pastor of the Church of the New Jerusalem, inspired forty guests at dinner with his charming "toastmastering." The guest of honor was the youthful J. Edward Jones, of Chicago, whose speech on "Economi Insecurity, Its Cause and Cure" brought many new young people into the Cincinnati Henry George Club. Other speakers were Herber S. Bigelow, pastor of the People's Church, and Dr. Mark Millikin and Hamilton. Mr. O. A. Toepfert was chairman of the dinner committee. The dinner was sponsored by the Henry George Foundation.

Cleveland, O., Saturday evening, May 31-A Single Tax dinner was held in Cleveland, O., May 14. The speakers were Claude L. Watso

David Gibson, publisher of the Loraine Journal and Mansfield Journal, and Marvin C. Harrison, Cleveland attorney. The toastmaster was John W. Raper, columnist on the Cleveland Press, who, we are told, is the author of that world famous line, "The Lord giveth, and the landlord taketh away." Hostesses for this occasion were Mrs. Horace Carr, Mrs. Edward A. Hach, Miss Mildred Parker, Mrs. J. E. Tuckerman and Miss Hazel Witt. Edgar S. Byers, attorney, was treasurer of the dinner committee, the dinner being sponsored by the Henry George Foundation of America.

\* \* \*

#### DETAILS OF TOUR OF CLAUDE L. WATSON

March 26—Toledo, O.; spoke to the Saturday Night Forum on "Why Poverty Amidst Plenty;" 200 present; at luncheon answered questions, and Mr. Monroe formed the nucleus of a Henry George Club for Toledo.

March 27—Pittsburgh, Pa.; 45-minute talk to the Pittsburgh Theosophical Society on "Unemployment: A Barrier to Brotherhood;" questions.

March 28—Pittsburgh, Pa.; addressed Hungry Club on "Why Poverty Amidst Plenty;" 45 minutes; an equal period of time to questions and answers; 300 present.

March 29—New Philadelphia, O.; after-luncheon talk to Lions Club on "Why Poverty Amidst Plenty;" a candidate for Congress was present and asked questions.

March 30—Martins Ferry, O.; Kiwanis Club of Martins Ferry and Bridgeport on "Why Poverty Amidst Plenty;" 50 present, including andidates for legislative and other offices.

April 1—Minerva, O.; after-dinner talk to Rotary Club on "Unemployment: A Challenge to America;" questions.

April 4—Dayton, O.; monthly banquet of the Dayton Real Estate Board on topic "Getting Rid of Tax Muddles." During discussion a number present brought out arguments in favor of Single Tax from the realtor's point of view.

April 5—Columbus, O.; talk to Lions Club on "Why Poverty Amidst Plenty." At 8:00 p. m. an hour's talk to Taxpayers' Research Association on "Tax Muddles," followed by lively period of questions, heckling and discussion lasting for almost two hours; 100 present.

April 6—Canton, O.; to members of Central Labor Union on "Why Poverty;" questions and discussion; inspiring meeting, one speaker saying it brought back to him the spirit of the days of Henry George.

April 7—Hamilton, O.; address to the Rotary Club, at which Mayor of Hamilton presided.

April 11—Marion, Ind.; talk to Lions Club, at which secretary of Y. M. C. A. presided; several ministers present, one a Georgist and two others remaining for an hour of question and discussion as to best way to spread philosophy; 30 present.

April 12—Hammond, Ind.; Rotary Club; several remained to ask questions and plan for other talks at later time; 25 present.

April 13—Michigan City, Ind.; 30 minutes to the Lions Club; several remained for further inquiry; five volunteered to act as committee to organize Henry George Club; 40 present.

April 14—La Porte, Ind.; spoke on "Tax Muddles" at noon-day meeting of Kiwanis Club; a number remained to ask questions; 30 present.

April 18—Birmingham, Mich.; noon luncheon of the Rotary Club, with members of Gyro Club present as guests; J. B. Howarth, a friend of Henry George and an ardent Single Taxer, presided; 50 present.

April 18—Flint, Mich.; an hour's talk to the Real Estate Association of Flint, on "Tax Muddles," followed by questions, discussion; 75 present.

April 19-Lansing, Mich.; noon day talk on "Unemployment"

to "Radiator Club" of Reo Motor Company, Mayor of Lansing and officials of company being in attendance; 75 present. At 6:00 p. m. gave talk on "Henry George's Religion" to Young Men's Forum of Y. M. C. A., at which Ray Robson gave address on "The Single Tax in Michigan;" 25 present. At 8:00 p. m. hour's address on "Why Poverty" to Henry George Club meeting in Municipal Court Room; questions and discussion; 75 present.

(In the intervals between meetings visits were made to the two branches of the State Legislature, which was in session to meet members of that body and listen to the discussions.)

April 20—Detroit, Mich.; Federation of Labor, meeting in the Labor Temple listened to an hour's talk on "Unemployment: A Challenge to Labor," emphasis being laid upon necessity of political action to put into effect labor's endorsement of Henry George as evidenced by two planks in the platform of the Detroit Federation of Labor, one favoring "taxation of land values irrespective of improvements," the other calling for the "abolition of all indirect taxes." In the hour of questions and discussion which followed, the president, Frank X. Martel, George Barclay (who had arranged for the talk) and other Detroit Single Taxers ably supported the point of view of the speaker; 200 present.

April 21—Grand Rapids, Mich.; Herman Friedrick, secretary of Grand Rapids Henry George Club, had made arrangements for a full day of activity. At noon a talk was given on "Why Poverty" at luncheon of "Wolverine Club," a number remaining for further inquiry; 40 present. This was followed by afternoon meeting of Henry George Club in Y. M. C. A., a number of Single Taxers from other cities present; talk on "Single Tax as a Way Out" was followed by questions and lively discussion; 25 present. At 8:00 p. m. an hour's talk at midweek meeting of Lutheran Church on "Poverty: A Challenge to Christianity," followed by a like period of inquiry and answers; Dr. Frank C. Jarvis, Congressional candidate and an active Single Taxer, presided; over 125 present.

April 22-Lansing, Mich.; return dates arranged by active workers of Lansing Henry George Club filled another day in Michigan State capital. The day began with talk on "The Fundamentals of Henry George" before Dr. Patten's class in political economy at Michigan State College in East Lansing; next an afternoon luncheon address to Women's Republican Club on "Solving Our Tax Problems," followed by questions and discussion; in addition to more than 100 members of the club present, there were several city, county and State officials and a number of aspirants for office in the approaching primaries; Mrs. R. C. Spencer, president of Women's Republican Club, active member of Henry George Club and delegate to the Republican National Convention, presided; Mrs. Ray Robson introduced the speaker. The day closed with a dinner by Henry George Club and Theosophical Society of Lansing, with Mr. Watson as guest of honor. Here he spoke upon "Henry George and Universal Brotherhood." Ray Robson, president of Henry George Club, reports a number of new members and increased interest as a result of Mr. Watson's visit.

April 24 to 29—South Bend, Ind.—From Lansing Mr. Watson went to South Bend, where Dr. E. G. Freyermuth had arranged for a full week of lecture engagements.

April 24 (Sunday)—Mr. Watson spoke on "The Way Out" before Men's Sunday Forum Club of First Christian Church of South Bend, the Rev. Elmer Ward Cole presiding; 30-minute talk, followed by a period of rapid-fire questions and answers; 175 in attendance.

April 25—Day began with talk before St. Joseph County Ministerial Association at South Bend Y. M. C. A. Mr. Watson spoke on "Poverty a Challenge to Christinaity," and offered the solution proposed by Henry George as the only one in harmony with Christian ideals. The questions propounded indicated a most receptive and sympathetic attitude on the part of twenty-five or more ministers and rabbis present. At noon a luncheon talk to members and guests of South

Bend Chamber of Commerce on "Getting Rid of Tax Muddles;" about 60 present. In the evening a talk to Carpenters' Union on "Unemployment," an hour devoted to talk and questions which followed; 40 members of union present.

April 26—Mishawaka, Ind.; day given over to this neighboring city; noonday talk to members of Mishawaka Exchange Club on "Taxation According to Benefits;" 20 members present. Evening talk on "Why Poverty Amidst Plenty" was given to members of Moose Lodge of Mishawaka; at least 35 present.

April 27 and 28—Days given over to personal talks with city officials, editors, business and professional men, a number of whom were found to be in sympathy with Single Tax principles and proposals.

April 29—Day opened with talk to 100 students of South Bend Business College on "The Equitable Distribution of Wealth," which held undivided attention of students and members of faculty. Then a noonday talk to members of Knights of Columbus, Mr. Watson speaking on "Henry George, the Man Sent From God," at the conclusion of which the chairman, in behalf of those present, assured the speaker they would not fail to follow up the study of the principles which had been presented.

The week's work was brought to a close by informal talk to members of South Bend Henry George Club, at which a number of new names were added to the list of members.

May 1—Milwaukee, Wis.; "Unemployment: A Barrier to Brother-hood" was subject of an hour's talk at a public meeting of Milwaukee Theosophical Society; followed by the customary question period, during which Mr. Watson was asked to sum up his impressions gained as a result of his recent lecture tour and the possibilities of growth of the Single Tax movement; at least 100 present.

May 4—Roseland, Ill.; noonday luncheon of Kiwanis Club; Mr. Watson spoke on "Why Poverty Amidst Plenty."

West Chicago was reached that evening, and an after-dinner talk on "Getting Rid of Tax Muddles" was followed by an hour of questions and discussions; 25 present.

May 5—Chicago, Ill.; meeting of Ogden Park Improvement Association; Mr. Watson spoke on "Unemployment and Taxation;" 35 members of association and some visitors present.

May 6—Chicago, Ill.; Logan Square Lions Club heard an address by Mr. Watson on "Why Poverty Amidst Plenty," which brought forth much questioning and discussion from a number who remained after the luncheon; 40 members and guests present.

# Schalkenbach Foundation Work

In the last issue of Land and Freedom reference was made to the advertising work of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation in reaching new people. The results of that February campaign among special lists of names, including high schools and colleges, and in which nearly 10,000 circulars were sent out, have been extremely gratifying. During March and April and early May 1,172 books have gone out of the office. This makes a total for the year May, 1931, to May, 1932, of 5,757 books distributed, of which 2,920 are the unabridged "Progress and Poverty." A very substantial part of this total comprises the orders received from high schools and colleges, and of course in that figure must be included various special distributions to libraries.

An editor of a small but well-run country newspaper, the Barnesville (Ga.) News-Gazette, happened to see our

bookplate in a copy of "Significant Paragraphs" that was given to the local library, and he became so interested in the book that he sent for other books by Henry George, including the unabridged "Progress and Poverty." We are asking Mr. Miller, editor of Land and Freedom, to reprint in full on page 102 the splendid front-page tribute that this editor, Mr. Ben Hardy, Jr., paid to the work of Henry George after reading "Progress and Poverty."

The advertising of Henry George's books in the New York neswpapers last autumn brought us requests for speakers from several organizations, which engagements were filled by Mr. Oscar Geiger. In addition to stimulating the sale of books both directly from the office and through the local bookstores, the demand for George's books in the public libraries was increased. After taking this matter up with the librarians, who aided us by inquiring from the local branches in regard to this demand, the Foundation donated to the various branch libraries in different parts of the city a total of 204 books, in accordance with specific requests for allotments. In Brooklyn and Queens the newspapers gave publicity to these donations

We spoke also in the last issue of an article on the Single Tax and its relation to the current depression, written by Mr. Byron W. Holt, which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. That paper very kindly reprinted 2,000 copies of Mr. Holt's article for the Foundation, and we distributed them to editors of news and trade papers and to publicists; sent a number of copies to various people who we thought might be interested. The article has been reprinted in full on the editorial pages of the Portland (Me.) News, the New Orleans Tribune, the Coshocton Tribune and the Atlantic City Press.

A letter from Mr. Waldauer, of Memphis, Tenn., informs us that a new enclave or colony has been started in Wall Hill, Miss., about thirty-five miles from Memphis. They have seven colonists and the enclavial land is under lease. This is the first experiment of the kind in the State of Mississippi.

Among the people whom we note in our news-clippings are the following who are doing active work of one kind or another in their respective communities:

Dr. Mark Millikin of Hamilton O.; Mr. James P. Kohler, Fort Myers, Fla.; Mr. A. C. Campbell, who spoke over the radio in Ottawa, Canada; Mr. Robson of Lansing Mich., who has organized a Henry George Club in that city Mr. A. G. Freyermuth, of South Bend., Ind., who is doing similar work in his community. There are a large number of men and women who are writing splendid letters to the newspapers. Among those whom we happened to notice this month are: Mrs. Cossette, Mr. Sudell, Mr. Graham Mr. Alexander, and our own director, Mr. Bolton Hall who had an interesting letter in the *New Republic* of April 20.

It may be of interest to note that in response to some of

our circulars that were sent to foreign countries we received, almost in the one mail, orders for a number of our books rom a Belgian baron, a member of the Persian Legation, and an American vice-consul in France.

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN, Secretary.

# Memphis Will Have Congress

POLLOWING a very aggressive and persistent campaign on the part of Memphis Single Taxers and civic organizations, the Seventh Annual Henry George Contress was unanimously awarded to Memphis by the Executive Committee of the Henry George Foundation. Competition was especially keen this year for the honor of entertaining the national Single Tax gathering, a strong ase also having been presented in behalf of Toronto, with the result that the decision was delayed somewhat longer than usual. But sentiment seemed to crystallize very definitely in favor of holding this year's Congress in the bouth, and the very cordial and enthusiastic invitation rom Memphis proved to be irresistible.

The dates of October 10 to 12 have been selected as nost suitable for this year's gathering, and the Hotel eabody, one of the finest hotels in the South, has been hosen as the official headquarters, as it affords admirable collities for conventions at moderate rates, comparing avorably with any heretofore offered in other convention ities.

In anticipation of the convention, the Memphis Single ax Club was reorganized within the past few months, and is already actively at work. Memphis has always een one of the bright spots of the Single Tax movement the South, and even in the early days had a very active and influential group of local workers, but, as in many ther communities, the local group disintegrated during the days of the World War. Under the stimulus of recent ational activities of the Henry George Foundation, a corganization of the Memphis Club has now been accombished, the Hon. A. B. Pittman, Judge of the Circuit ourt, having been chosen president, and P. M. Birmingam, secretary.

A strong convention committee is being formed, Judge ittman having been appointed chairman of this committee, be D. Waldauer, assistant city attorney of Memphis, ce chairman, and P. M. Birmingham, secretary. The onvention Bureau of the Chamber of Commerce has ven assurance of its whole-hearted cooperation and is ready at work on plans to stimulate interest and enlarge te attendance.

No Single Tax convention of a national character has rer been held in the South, and it was felt that this great ction of the country is deserving of recognition and of a rger share of attention at this stage in the development the national movement. Memphis is geographically e center of the nation, and is served by ten trunk line ilroads leading in every direction, not to mention splendid

automobile roads available for those traveling in that manner.

No effort will be spared to provide a strong programme for this year's Congress, as it is believed that it will attract unusual attention, owing to the rapidly growing interest in economic problems which has developed out of the severe industrial depression with which the world is now afflicted. Every newspaper in Memphis has pledged full cooperation in giving the convention proceedings adequate publicity, and there have already been some excellent advance notices in the press, including a strong editorial of welcome recently published in the *Memphis Labor Review*. A city-wide radio hook-up will be arranged for at least part of the programme, enabling the Congress to convey its message direct to the general public.

# A Single Taxer Answers

In a report of a speech by Charles N. Edge, Mr. Edge is quoted as saying that the problem that confronts society at present is "the displacement of man by machine," and the solution that he suggests for this problem, according to the report, is "a shift in taxation from land to machine."

As justification for this solution the report quotes Mr. Edge as offering: (a) "The true value of a worker depends upon the value of the land;" (b) "as far back as records go, the basic value and obtainable wage of a man has been half of the produce from the land he rents and can work," and (c) "the transfer of taxation from land to the machine would have the immediate effect of increasing the value of land throughout the country."

In statement (a) Mr. Edge places himself at variance with all correct economic reasoning from Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill and David Ricardo down. It is an axiom in economics that the value of land arises out of, and depends upon, the community's presence, its activities, its needs and effective demand for land, and on its productivity, thrift and law-abiding qualities. Thus, if we were to more correctly state the case, we would have to reverse Mr. Edge's form to read: "the true value of land depends on labor itself"—labor, of course, including all who come by their wealth or earnings by rendering value or services in return for it.

If statement (b) is analyzed, it merely tells us that land, without itself producing anything, is able to exact half of all that labor produces; for in production, land is a passive factor, merely permitting production, while labor and capital are the active factors, producing everything.

Statement (c) is correct, and that is why Mr. Edge's proposed remedy is wrong. The value of land represents the amount of the product land is able to exact from the producer for the mere privilege it grants him to produce. The higher land value is, the more it absorbs of the product; therefore, the higher land value is the less is left to the producer.

We have already reversed Mr. Edge's findings; let us

now reverse his proposed remedy and perhaps we may find the solution of the problem that really is confronting society. Abolish the taxation that is now burdening industry. Remove all taxes from machinery, tools, farm implements, houses, business structures, and all improvements; from food products, materials and merchandise of all descriptions; from incomes, thrift and production, and put it all on the value of land.

It is an axiom in economics that taxation on labor products is added to the price of commodities, makes them dearer, weakens the effective demand for them and thus tends to unemployment. It is equally axiomatic that a tax on land values (especially if the entire economic rent is taken) discourages only the holding of land out of use, and therefore makes for the employment of labor.

Labor employed will make effective the consumers' potential demand, will translate underconsumption into underproduction, and will put an end to all that now is troubling our industrial and economic structure. And as for "the displacement of man by machine" (the problem visioned by Mr. Edge), we will have to invent more and better machines to keep pace with the demand.

-OSCAR H. GEIGER in Wall Street Journal.

# Progress and Poverty

ROM all parts of the civilized world come complaints of industrial depression: of labor condemned to involuntary idleness; trial depression; of labor condemned to involuntary idleness; of capital massed and wasting; of pecuniary distress among business men; of want and suffering and anxiety among the working classes. All the dull, deadening pain, all the keen, maddening anguish, that to great masses of men are involved in the words 'hard times,' have afflicted the world. This state of things, common to communities differing so widely in situation, in political institution, in fiscal and financial systems, in density of population and in social organization, can hardly be accounted for by local causes. There is distress where large standing armies are maintained, but there is also distress where the standing armies are nominal; there is distress where protective tariffs stupidly and wastefully hamper trade, but there is also distress where trade is nearly free; there is distress where autocratic government yet prevails, but there is also distress where political power is wholly in the hands of the people; in countries where paper is money, and in countries where gold and silver are the only currency. Evidently, beneath all such things as these, we must infer a common cause."

The foregoing words, describing world conditions of 1932 with uncanny precision, were written in 1877. They are taken from a book of which it has been said that no man can consider himself educated until he has read it. The book is "Progress and Poverty" and the author is Henry George. Until a few days ago I had never opened the book, though I had heard much of Henry George and the Single Tax. I found in the Carnegie Library of Barnesville a small volume of "Significant Paragraphs" culled from the original text, which I am now reading in its entirety.

One does not have to agree with Henry George in his conclusion that a Single Tax on land is the principal solution of our difficulties—though it is virtually impossible to resist his logic—to be deeply affected by his words. Whether or not his thesis is correct, Henry George's book proves its right to existence by the passionate, poetic expression of his love of humanity. His powerful description of suffering—needless suffering that could be prevented by the proper use of man's intelligence—and his eloquent plea for a better world, stir the reader to the depths.

On one point, certainly, there is no question but that he is right (our

depression is but another proof of his point): that the great enigma of civilization is the fact that "material progress not only fails to relieve poverty—it actually produces it." Review the history of America or any other industrial nation: is not depression as typical of our life as prosperity? Until the solution is found and the remedy is applied, civilization as we know it contains the seed of its own destruction, and the question is how many depressions can it withstand before going the way of Egypt, Greece and Rome.

While officeholders toy with relief, Henry George goes back to fundamentals. How is all wealth, in the final analysis, produced? It is the result of labor exerted on land. As a country grows and prospers, its land is got into the possession of men anxious to own the wealth to be produced on the land, until all the available supply is possessed. What of the men who come afterward, either by immigration or by birth? There is no land for them to exert their labor on; therefore the lucky owners of land allow them access to the land—for a price. That price is all the wealth produced by their labor on the land, except what is necessary to keep the laborers alive and contented. The land—the basis of all wealth—is in the handsof a few, and the many are denied the profit of their own labor on the land. Though individuals may overcome this difficulty by eventual purchase of land themselves the same situation continues to prevail; ownership of land may change but the relative number of owners and non-owners remains practically fixed.

The remedy is the Single Tax, according to Henry George. Space forbids even a condensation of his argument here, and it should be read in the original words of the thinker.

Until an adjustment is made in our economic system so that the masses may have access to the land and may enjoy the fruits of their labor thereon, the Constitution of the United States may grant to al citizens the pursuit of happiness, but our social order denies them the capture of it.—BEN HARDY, JR., in Barnesville (Ga.) News-Gazette.

### Note to Our Readers

In the last issue of Land and Freedom a news item of the activities of the Chicago Single Tax League was carried among a number of similar items relating to othe organizations, beneath a general heading of the Henry George Lecture Association. Mr. Henry L. Tideman the active secretary of the Chicago Single Tax League asks that we correct any possible misapprehensions by informing our readers that the League is a wholly independent organization, not affiliated with, or subordinate to, any other, although cooperating heartily with the Henry George Lecture Association, whose president, Millohn Lawrence. Monroe, is also one of the directors of the League.

Readers of this issue of LAND AND FREEDOM who as unfamiliar with the refinements of interpretation respecting our principles which are discussed in this number should not allow themselves to be misled. The follower of Henry George are united in the belief that, whatever the exact economic phenomena of interest and rent, the values attaching to land are not the result of individual effort and should be taken for community purposes. Also that one human being has no greater right to advantage or locations than another, and that the man in possession favored sites should pay to the community the value of that advantage. These are the fundamentals on which we are all agreed.

Again we favor our readers with an issue of forty page eight pages over the usual number.

# Death of Arthur C. Pleydell

As we go to press news comes of the passing of A. C. Pleydell. It is too late for an adequate summary of his life in this issue, his long and useful career and his great services to the cause. A full account will appear in our next issue, with tributes from his many devoted friends.

Despite a certain retiring modesty, some of us knew of the great work he did for the principles in which he believed and which today animate so many who came under his influence.

# Blackstone Knew

THERE is nothing which so generally strikes the imagination, and engages the affections of mankind, as the right of property; or that sole and despotic dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in total exclusion of the right of any other individual in the universe. And yet there are few that will give themselves the trouble to consider the original and foundation of this right. Pleased as we are with the possession, we seem afraid to look back to the means by which it was acquired, as if fearful of some defect in our title: or at best we rest satisfied with the decision of the laws in our favor, without examining the reason or authority upon which those laws have been built. We think it enough that our title is derived by the grant of the former proprietor, by descent from our ancestors, or by the last will and testament of the dying owner; nor caring to reflect that (accurately and strictly speaking) there is no foundation in nature or in natural law why a set of words upon parchment should convey the dominion of land; why the son should have a right to exclude his fellow creatures from a determinate spot of ground because his father had done so before him, or why the occupier of a particular field, when lying on his death bed and no longer able to maintain possession, should be entitled to tell the rest of the world which of them should enjoy it after him.—Blackstone's Commentaries, Book 2, Chapter 1.

# A Welcome to Memphis

QUITE the most remarkable convention in local history will meet in Memphis this fall, on October 10, 11 and 12. It will be that of the Henry George Foundation of America, in national assemblage, and will attract some of the world's deepest thinkers to Tennessee—and the Lord only knows how we need 'em.

These Single Taxers will find a virgin field in this part of the country.

For forty years Judge A. B. Pittman has been one of the few Single Taxers in this section. Others include men like Bolton Smith and Abe Waldauer. The lamented R. Gratz Brown was a Single Taxer. Any group these local

citizens would invite to Memphis you may be sure has a worthy object.

The famous words of Henry George back in 1879 are just as pertinent today. Indeed, they are tragically apropos at the present moment in our economic distress. Henry George said this:

"We propose to abolish all taxes save one single tax levied on the value of land, irrespective of the value of improvements in or on it.

"What we propose is not a tax on real estate, for real estate includes improvements. Nor is it a tax on land, for we would not tax all land, but only land having a value irrespective of its improvements, and would tax that in proportion to that value.

"Our plan involves the imposition of no new tax, since we already tax land values in taxing real estate. To carry it out we have only to abolish all taxes save the tax on real estate, and to abolish all of that which now falls on buildings or improvements, leaving only that part of it which now falls on the value of the bare land, increasing that so as to take as nearly as may be the whole of economic rent, or what is sometimes styled the 'unearned increment of land values.'

"That the value of the land alone would suffice to provide all needed public revenues—municipal, county, State and national—there is no doubt."

The Single Taxer doesn't think his plan will change human nature, but that it will bring about conditions in which human nature can develop what is best, instead of as now in so many cases, what is worst.

Judge Pittman believes that it will secure an equitable distribution, solve the labor problem, make undeserved poverty an unknown thing, and check the soul-destroying greed for gain.

And as Henry George said, since we cannot conceive of a Heaven in which the equal rights of God's children to their Father's bounty is denied, as we now deny them on this earth, what is the duty enjoined on Christians by the daily prayer: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth, as it is in Heaven."—Memphis Labor Review.

# Holding the Sack

AND speculators leaped ahead of population so fast that now they are holding the sack with thousands of subdivided acres which cannot be sold for any price. That explains the political cry of relief for real estate.

The small home owner is being used as a shield for the efforts of land speculators to lower tax burdens on land values. Once lowered, idle land will be easier to hold out of use, the price will go up, and the speculators will profit once again. The small home owner whose taxes are levied mainly on his improvements and personal property, labor products, will find his tax burden going up even more than the land speculator's goes down.—Ingram Institute News.

# Uses Intelligence as to Land

In Northern Nigeria, now the Northern Provinces, urban and rural land is let on permits of indefinite term, with reassessment of the full site value for revenue every few years. There is no litigation to secure such titles, and multitudes of people live in rapidly increasing comfort as shown by production returns; and the local treasuries, which carry out nearly all Government duties, are richly financed, with no need of any form of taxation on trade or accumulation.

There must be no misunderstanding on this point; the land value duly confiscated does provide richly for all public needs, no taxes are needed, and would-be producers do get access to any idle land without suffering blackmail for the privilege; there is no land litigation either between persons or tribal or municipal-organized groups.

All the facts given above are drawn from West Africa, 1926, by Mr. Ormsby-Gore, late Conservative Under-Secretary for the Colonies.—Land and Liberty, February, 1929.

THE story is told that Washington could throw a dollar across the Potomac and find it afterward on the bank where it fell, though he might not have looked for it for several days. Banks on the Potomac were safer then.

#### **BOOK REVIEWS**

AN INTERESTING BOOK\*

This work, which has attained prominence as a "best seller"—150,000 in a few months, we believe—makes no effort to treat fundamentally of America's history and progress. Mr. Adams tells us his object has been "rather to paint a picture with broad strokes of the brush our variegated past."

Many faults might be found with it. The picture of the Indians as "a savage and barbaric race" must be taken *cum grano salis*. That they were "cruel and revengeful" and of "hysterical make-up" must also be subject to a certain modification which a more careful exercise of the scholarship in the gift of the writer would have done much to correct.

He is alive to the economic advantages offered by free natural opportunities to the new settlers, and says: "With free land easily obtainable there was little or no reason why a hard-working, ambitious man should have to work for another instead of himself. (Page 38.)

He returns to the lessons of these conditions more than once throughout the book. He shows their bearing upon the growth of democracy. He is everywhere alive to their importance.

He tells us that he finds, "despite the lonely roads through the woods, but one case of highway robbery in the colonial period." The cause seems to be clear to him: "Under better economic conditions crimes against person or property became rare in the colonies." Prof. Adams' knowledge of economics is sounder than that of many whose business it is to teach it.

On page 61 he says: "The large land holdings were got for the most part in devious ways."

He shows how Jefferson and others labored for emancipation, but

without results. (Page 104.) He shows that Jefferson was influenced by the French philosophers to some extent, but that he had complete faith in the ordinary citizen." (Page 111.)

On page 157 Prof. Adams gives an account of the passing of the country magnate and the appearance of the city landlord, when the herding of the population into small quarters began. He senses the breaking down of economic democracy in the North (1830-1840), due to the preemption of the best lands in the cities. Cause and consequence are related in a few telling sentences, covering the period from 1800 to 1830.

There is an account (page 168) of the influence of Henry Clay, and Prof. Adams tells us that protectionists who have succeeded him have merely rung the changes on the speech he made in March, 1824.

Perhaps he is not quite fair to Jackson, for, though "a duelling, swashbuckling hero," he was not without certain excellent qualities that have left their impress upon the Republic.

On page 212 mention is made of the orgy of land speculation leading to the panic of 1837. There are passages dealing with the moral consequences following a prevailing devotion to mere money getting, and the prevalence of crime and disorder which is repeating itself in the present era.

There are some thoughts boldly proclaimed dealing with the World War, the causes leading to it, and our entry into it.

On the whole Mr. Adams has made a useful book, with much shrewd comment and sanity of observation, among which we would give unstinted praise to the fine and wholly discriminating tribute to the character of George Washington.

There is also a rather searching account of William Jennings Bryan and his campaigns, briefly touched upon, and the causes that lay behind Free Silver, which Prof. Adams recognizes was but the symbol of revolt. This might have been written by Henry George himself, so astutely penetrating is it, resembling Mr. George's great pamphlet "Beneath the Silver Question."

And, by the way, why was there not a mention of Henry George? And when we are discussing omissions, why not a mention as well of Thomas A. Edison, of Wendell Phillips, of the Christian Science movement? And while the Ku Klux Klan of Civil War days is referred to, why no mention of its more recent picturesque successor with a membership of more than three millions?

The author's criticism of Henry Ford is misplaced censure. The \$50 profit which Ford makes on each automobile he manufactures cannot begin to compare with the hundreds of dollars' benefit the farmer receives by reason of having purchased easy and quick transportation from the farm to the city.

Of course Prof. Adams has not attempted an answer to the problems that are crowding on us. That was not his purpose; he has, as he tells us, but set himself to paint a picture in "broad strokes." Therefore, perhaps it is not fair to find fault with him for the things he has not said, the profound causes he has not touched upon, the fundamental truths of which it was no part of his purpose to treat. Some of these he has at least sensed and in partial lights envisioned.

B. W. B.

#### A GREAT CAREER \*

A man named Henry George wrote a book. To a great number of men and women life thereafter was never the same. Many met him personally and had the advantage of that great companionship. He touched them by his writings and by his remarkable personality with something like a divine fire.

Samuel Seabury fell under that influence. He read "Progress and Poverty" and met the author. The high-minded youth whose intellect was of a serious cast had his career determined for him then and there. Something of the tradition inherited from distinguished forebears

<sup>\*</sup>The Epic of America. By James Truslow Adams. 8vo; cloth; price \$3.75. Little, Brown & Co., Boston, Mass.

<sup>\*</sup>Samuel Seabury: A Challenge. By Walter Chambers: cloth; 12mo; 389 pages; illustrated. Price \$3.50. The Century Company, New York City.

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. D. M.

#### ANOTHER AUTHOR WITH A "SOLUTION" \*

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

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

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

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

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

If there is any really great fortune which is not based primarily on the inequality that results from the divorcement of man from the land, we do no know of it. The Rockefeller fortune, which is referred to often by the author of this book, would largely disintegrate were land values taken by the people. Railroads, oil wells and pipe lines are land, and the Rockefeller fortune was built up by private ownership in these resources, and public utilities based on land. Every great fortune would be severely hit by the so-called Single Tax (inadequate name') more severely indeed than even by the form of "capital levy" Mr. Klein suggests. For that reform would forever prevent their rebuilding. For those fortunes that rest on patent monopoly, which are not of great significance, other preventive measures might be applied.

J. D. M.

# Correspondence

DEFENDS PROHIBITION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

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

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

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

Cordele, Ga. Howell Clopton Harris.

#### RENT-COST-PRICE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

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

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

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

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

to reduce his price 5 per cent, which reduction the tenant could make, and which he would be free to make, or not, as he might choose. He would merely be in the same position as though a relative died and left him an income equal to 5 per cent of the value of the goods sold in his store. If he so chose he could pass the gift along to his customers by reducing his prices 5 per cent and enjoy the same net income as GEORGE L. RUSBY.

Towaco, N. J.

#### JOHN ROSE DIGS TRUTHS FROM OLD TOMES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

We Georgists hold that cheap or available land will insure prosperity and preclude the possibility of poverty. This is no idle speculation, as the old records attest. Take the early history of Pennsylvania, for instance, as described by Gabriel Thomas in his book, "An Historical and Geographical Account of the Province and Country of Pennsylvania" (London, 1698):

"Corn and Flesh, and what else serves Man for Drink, Food and Rayment, is much cheaper here than in England, or elsewhere; but the chief reason why Wages of Servants of all sorts is much higher here than there, arises from the great Fertility and Produce of the Place; besides if these large Stipends were refused them, they would quickly set up for themselves, for they can have Provision very cheap, and Land for a very small matter, or next to nothing in comparison of the Purchase of Lands in England; and the Farmers there can better afford to give that great Wages than the Farmers in England can, for several

Reasons very obvious.
"Their Land costs them (as I said but just now) little or nothing in comparison, of which the Farmers commonly will get twice the increase of Corn for every Bushel they sow, that the Farmers in England can

from the richest Land they have.

"They pay no Tithes, and their Taxes are inconsiderable; the Place Incy pay no Tries, and their faxes are inconsiderable, the Frace is free for all Persuasions, in a Sober and Civil way; for the Church of England and the Quakers bear equal Share in the Government. They live Friendly and Well together; there is no Persecution for Religion, nor ever like to be; 'tis this that knocks all Commerce on the Head, together with high Imposts, strict Laws, and cramping Orders."

The anonymous author of "American Husbandry" (by an American, London, 1775), while quite favorable to the colonies, probably does not exaggerate the prosperity of New England. He says:

"The face of the country has in general a cultivated, inclosed and cheerful prospect; the farm houses are well and substantially built, and stand thick; gentlemen's houses appear everywhere, and have an air of a wealthy and contented people. Poor, strolling and ragged beggars are scarcely ever to be seen; all the inhabitants of the country appear to be well fed, cloathed, and lodged, and everywhere a great degree of independency, and liberty to be met with: nor is that distinction of the ranks and classes to be found which we see in Britain, but which is infinitely more apparent in France and other arbitrary

countries. \* \* \*
"This great ease of gaining a farm, renders the lower class of people very industrious; which, with the high price of labour, banishes everything that has the least appearance of begging, or that wandering, destitute state of poverty which we see so common in England. A traveller might pass half through the colony without finding, from the appearance of the people, that there was such a thing as a want

of money among them. \* \* \* \*
"This country [Pennsylvania] is peopled by as happy and free a set of men as any in America. Out of trade there is not much wealth to be found, but at the same time there is very little poverty, and hardly such a thing as a beggar in the province. This is not only a consequence of the plenty of land and the rate of labour, but also of the principles of the Quakers who have a considerable share in the government of the country. It is much to the honour of this sect that they support their own poor in all countries, in a manner much more respectable than known in any other religion."

Henry George men hold that wherever there is private property in land rent, and wherever land is held out of use, there poverty abounds. Take the condition of the poor whites in Virginia in 1780, as observed and noted by the Marquis F. J. Chastellux in his book, "Travels in N. America, in the Years 1780, 1781 and 1782" (published in London, 1787):

"It is in this country (Virginia) that I saw poor persons, for the first time, after I passes the sea; for, in the midst of those rich planta-tions, where the negro alone is wretched, miserable huts are often to

be met with, inhabited by whites, whose wan looks and ragged garments bespeak poverty. At first I was puzzled to explain to myself how, in a country where there is still so much land to clear, men who do not refuse to work should remain in misery; but I have since learned that all these useless territories, these immense estates, with which Virginia is covered, have their proprietors. Nothing is more common than to see some of them possessing five or six thousand acres of land, who clear out only as much as their negroes can cultivate; yet will they not give, or even sell, the smallest portion of them, because they form a part of their possessions, and they are in hopes of one day augmenting the number of their negroes. These white men, without fortune, and frequently without industry, are straitened, therefore, on every side, and reduced to the small number of acres they are able to acquire."

Contrast the above description of landed wealth and poverty with the description of another section of the country as given by Isaac Weld, Jr., in his book, "Travels Through the States of N. America, &c." (London, 1800):

"The cultivated lands in this country [Shenandoah Valley] are mostly parcelled out in small portions; there are no persons here, as mostly parcelled out in small portions; there are no persons here, as on the other side of the mountains, possessing large farms; nor are there any eminently distinguished by their education or knowledge from the rest of their fellow citizens. Poverty also is as much unknown in this country as great wealth. Each man owns the house he lives in and the land which he cultivates, and everyone appears to be happy and unambitious of a more elevated situation than what he himself enjoys." JOHN C. ROSE.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

#### MAY BE GOOD NEWS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Taxation is looking up.

The Harvard class in economics has dropped in numbers from 140 to 91. This means that 49 less students will be taught economics THOMAS N. ASHTON. that are not sound.

Fall River, Mass.

#### EVIDENCE OF APPRECIATION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I thank you for sending me LAND AND FREEDOM here. I had figured on reading it in the local public library. Generally I prefer to have it sent to my home, as then there is no danger of losing it. I always read it carefully when I return home, even if I have read it while away. I also keep every copy on file. I can read the back numbers with as much interest as those of today. I regard it as a very valuable educational journal, as well as a leader in Single Tax philosophy and news. I have been here nearly two months working up a case for electric light reduction, where Attorney La Follette is representing 9,000 petitioners, who ask the State Corporation Commission to reduce rates. Generally, during my vacation, I do not stay in any place more than a week or two. Therefore I depend on the public libraries to keep me up to date. EDWARD P. E. TROY.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.

#### FROM AN OLD FRIEND OF THE PAPER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I want to congratulate you on the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM The contributed articles, taken together with your own expressions of opinion, actually constitute a liberal education for the student of

I wish also to give belated approval of the opening paragraphs in Comment and Reflection of preceding issue, pertaining to our vision hopes, aspirations and the need for a becoming humility in the presence of a truth of such magnitude and far-reaching potentialities.

Best wishes for continued success.

C. M. Hoose.

Philadelphia, Pa.

#### A FALLACY IN CURRENT TERMINOLOGY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I want to make a suggestion. It has seemed to me that a great dea of confusion exists due to the comprehensive nature of the words "rea

state" and the more modern word "realty." From the standpoint of anything affecting rents and taxation, these words include two substantially opposite things. The first the unimproved land, and the second the improvements fixed upon it. As to the one, the amount is unchanging, whatever is paid for it and whatever the amount of axation; in the other the amount is increasing and decreasing with its demand value and according to how much it is taxed. With the one, taxation reduces selling price, thereby increasing the amount vailable for its use, and reduces rents; with the other, taxation decreases the amount available, and raises rents.

All this is, of course, familiar, but everywhere we see newspapers, oliticians, etc., talking of the tax on real estate and generally involving the conclusion that increased tax on real estate or increased assessment on real estate, which is the same thing, must increase rents and take real estate take more than its fair share, all of which is true as that part of the tax on the real estate which falls on improvements, thereas the other part is an unmitigated blessing.

I think a great deal of confusion among the non-Single Taxers who te trying to reasonably figure taxation problems would be eliminated the thought that the word real estate includes, from the standpoint taxation, two exactly opposite things, could be gotten over, and in uch a way as would shame any one who tried to argue about the effect taxation on real estate without making any distinction between the wo parts which make up this somewhat incongruous term. My aggestion is that you, who know the subject so well and who could ell expand upon and polish my crude thought, should try your hand some sort of tract on the subject, as well as treating it in your paper. New York City.

RICHARD EYRE.

#### HATS OFF TO BROTHER KOHLER!

DITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

You may be interested to know that I have addressed large and intellient audiences in Florida while sojourning here since December last.

At St. Petersburg, where I spoke last winter at the Public Forum, had the largest audience of the season. Amplifiers were necessary to ach the outer edge. I had one hour and thirty minutes, with a half our for questions.

At Fort Myers in the Court House the Good Government League stened with great eagerness for an hour and twenty minutes. Many wyers and judges were present to whom my presentation of the cause poverty was entirely new.

At one of the Miami high schools the graduating class of young men d women were followers of the outline and illustrations to justify agle Tax claims.

At the Riverside Baptist Church in Miami I spoke for an hour and half. The Junior Chamber of Commerce also got the message at one their weekly dinners.

The Three Score and Ten Club of 1,400 members, with a weekly und-table discussion, listened to me for two hours.

The Greater Miami Women's Club at the Columbus Hotel gave me ty minutes at their Forum debate against a millionaire named tomas, an automobile manufacturer. Another women's club is tanging a date for me. I shall be glad to fill any dates that other eakers cannot cover.

In presenting the subject I deem it wise to show the fallacy of the eged cause for the depression given by such men as Prof. Irving sher, President Hoover, and even by Walter Lippmann, who should ow better, and that profound faker Brisbane, who addressed an dience here and practically argued in behalf of our present land sysm, ending by advocating a sales tax.

The Miami Daily News is broadening, and some of its editorials very favorable. It has not turned down any of my letters, which getting attention.

No place on earth presents such an example of the foolishness of ind booming as does Miami and other Florida towns. I bought a 2,000 home for \$2,200, and a \$12,000 lot for \$400, on which I expect

to build at once. Living is cheaper here than anywhere else in the United States—a course dinner for 25 cents, a feast for 75 cents. Fish fresh out of the bay 6 to 10 cents a pound, and other food in proportion. Store rents here are very low.

There are quite a few Single Taxers here, among them some that were in the first George campaign. We may get together for a dinner soon.

J. P. KOHLER.

Miama, Fla.

# News Notes and Personals

HENRY HARRISON, a publisher of this city, announces the appearance of a four-act dramatization of Oscar Wilde's novel "The Portrait of Dorian Gray," by Marion Mills Miller.

C. Barsony, of Arad, Roumania, a convinced Georgist, is auxious to establish communication with the comrades everywhere. He informs the secretary of the Henry George Foundation of the activities of a group of disciples in Roumania.

Following the celebration of his eightieth birthday, F. W. Maguire, assistant secretary of the Henry George Foundation, suffered a severe indisposition, but has recovered and is able to visit headquarters.

"You got out a wonderful issue this time," writes George E. Mecorney, of Floral Park, L. I., commenting on the March-April number of LAND AND FREEDOM. And he adds: "Of all the avenues being used to further our cause, LAND AND FREEDOM is the most important."

Donald MacDonald, of Fairbanks, Alaska, is anxious to secure copies of "The Shovelcrats," written by our old friend Craig Ralston. Also copies of the Tolstoy pamphlet containing the appeal to the Czar to put into practical effect Henry George's proposals.

The itinerary covered by Mr. Charles H. Ingersoll in his speaking tour under the direction of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, as well as the independent itinerary on which he has now started, called forth an astonishing number of favorable press notices. His recent addresses in Portland, Ore., brouht favorable reports in the Journal as well as in the News-Telegram of that city. In both papers Mr. Ingersoll is quoted at length. He has opened a booking office at 242 Maynard Street, San Francisco, and George Cartwright, once private secretary to Tom L. Johnson, is in charge.

THE Hartselle (Ala.) Enterprise prints many straightout Single Tax articles. The editor and publisher is Mr. C. R. Walker. Commenting on the Lindbergh kidnaping case, Mr. Walker says: "There is no hope of preventing crime without removing its cause. Want and the fear of want is at the bottom of practically all crime."

HON. EDWARD POLAK, of this city, former Register of the Bronx, addressed a letter to the House Ways and Means Committee at Washington and to members of Congress to consider a tax on land values in lieu of the proposed sales tax.

We learn of the death of William H. Faulhaber, of this city. Mr. Faulhaber was, if our memory serves us correctly, the first president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club.

WE acknowledged receipt of A Terra, the new Georgist organ of Rio de Janeiro, in March-April Land and Freedom. The programme is two-fold: First, to promote by all means in its power the spread of Georgism in Brazil, and, second, to establish a Georgist Center to unite all the Georgists living in Brazil under a single banner, and so

give unity of action in the struggle for the common ideal. In this issue before us Amelio de Moraes says:

"Whether near or far, the goal we have before us—viz., the taxation of land apart from improvements—we have confidence in ourselves, in all our collaborators and in all those who, whether Brazilians or not, throughout the hills and vales of our vast national territory, have within their soul the passion for a country free and happy."

Two pages of A Terra are taken up by the beginning of a new Portuguese translation of "Progress and Poverty." It is a miniature edition, so arranged that one page of the paper will include four pages of the book. The translation is made by Americo Werneck, secretary of the periodical.

A NEW Single Tax colony has been established in Mississippi to be known as the "Enclave of Wall Hill." Mr. H. C. Lutton is one of the pioneers or the movement. We hope to give further details later.

THE Los Angeles Times, commenting on the Jubilee Year of the ancient Hebrews, says it was designed for a simple and pastoral people, but that our modern financial leaders might learn much from a study of the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus. Good!

OUR March-April issue chronicled the death of Mrs. Schalkenbach, widow of Robert Schalkenbach, founder of the Schalkenbach Foundation. Mrs. Schalkenbach, who passed away at her home in New York City, was well known to local Henry George people. She was born in Preston, Ont., but was a resident of the United States from her youth. Her body was conveyed to West Branch, Mich., and funeral services were held at Campbell Corners, in West Branch, at the home of her sister, Mrs. Charles Bennett, Rev. E. A. Flory officiating. It should be said that she was in entire sympathy with the will of her husband which endowed the Foundation. She and Robert had many a talk on the propaganda for the principles of Henry George. In these principles she believed as strongly as her husband, and so in honoring him we honor the wife who entered enthusiastically into his plans and was a factor in their accomplishment.

Congratulations on the liberal spirit shown by *Tidings*, a forward-looking Catholic paper published in Los Angeles. Commenting on a recent address of Bishop Cantwell, it says: "The Bishop pointed out that if the rights of the laboring man are not better looked after than they are now by the capitalists, neither laws nor anything else would prevent communism from taking hold in this country."

C. L. St. John is an independent candidate for Minnedosa (Manitoba) riding. His programme includes the destruction of all forms of private monopoly, and socialization of ground rents, natural resources and all public utilities. An admirable and ringing indictment of present conditions occupies a full page of the local paper. Mr. St. John declares in this article, which is his platform, that the old economic order, which is more appropriately referred to as monopolism than capitalism, has definitely and disastrously failed."

WILLIAM MATTHEWS of Spokane, Washington, writes us:

"We had a very interesting and successful Single Tax campaign in Spokane Sunday, May 15th to the 19th inclusive, during the stay of Mr. Chas. H. Ingersoll.

We succeeded in keeping him pretty busy with three or four dates each day. Mr. Ingersoll seemed to enjoy the work and his visit with us very much, and he is very skillful in putting the message across."

WE have received from Henry E. Foelske a pamphlet of fifty-four pages entitled "Bondholders, Attention—The Rational Remedy." A review of this will appear later.

FROM our friend Poultney Bigelow comes an interesting pamphlet,

"John Bigelow and Napoleon III," in which our Malden friend tell of his father's work at the French court during the Civil War period John Bigelow was minister to France and rendered important service to the Union. Poultney Bigelow tells the story interestingly. John Bigelow was a great American and occupies a high place in the annal of our country. The pamphlet is a reprint from New York History Magazine for April, 1932.

THE father of Joseph H. Fink died Saturday, May 21. He wa eighty-three years old and worked up to within a few days of his deatl

A RECENT article in the *Times-Standard Union*, of Brooklyn, N. Y contained an article of Edward T. O'Loughlin, one of the columnist of that paper, reviewing the career of Dr. McGlynn. This brought flood of letters from people resident on Long Island and elsewher recalling memories of the former pastor of St. Stephen's in Manhattai Mr. O'Loughlin was surprised at the number of those who wrote quotin passages from Dr. McGlynn's great addresses at the meetings of the Anti-Poverty Society.

Our congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. George C. Madison, of Chicagwho on May 17 celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of their wedding. Mr. Madison has been active in the Single Tax movement almost a long.

In the *News Chronicle*, of London, England, dated May 14, Sercival Perry, chairman of the English Ford Company, says in a interview headed "The Strangle Hold on Trade": "The measures protect the currency while killing trade illustrate the utter folly the present situation." Sir Percival makes other significant and wi statements in the course of the interview.

WE suggest to our readers that they send for a sample copy of t Ingram Institute News, published by the Ingram Institute, at 854 Eigh Street, San Diego, Calif. This is a wideawake and well-edited journ of political economy, carried on by the founder of the Institute, F. Ingram. It is a dignified and aggressive organ of our principles. see it is to subscribe if you have the money.

CHARGES of land speculation have been brought against the Winsburg, Pa., school board. A suit will be filed compelling the boat to place forty acres of land recently acquired for a recreation centron the tax rolls. The charge is brought by Andrew A. McKeev township tax collector, an aggressive Single Taxer and a convert. Mr. McNair.

WE are glad to receive a pamphlet containing a report of the Spec Committee of the American Institute of Architects on Taxation relation to architecture and the practice of the profession. We we we had space for more extracts from this very gratifying report. is the strongest argument in favor of land-value taxation emanat from a conservative organization which we remember to have se For example, what can be better than this:

"Even children understand, and realtors boast, that site values created by the presence of population and the taxes it pays, and these taxes are paid because they do provide streets, parks, scho and all other improvements and services the whole community deci it needs. Why, then, should the building owner not insist that site owner apply the rent paid him to financing the things for whe receives rent, thus freeing the building owner from double pment of rent and taxes? Why should he pay for them once to the owner and again to the tax collector? The answer seems to be sound business principles are to be adhered to, that if the build owner pays for these publicly created benefits in his rent, the site ow should supply them; if he pays for them in his taxes, there would sto be no sound business reason for paying the site owner."

MEETINGS are being held at the home of Mrs. Anna George de M

r the purpose of discussing subjects of interest to the movement, wo well-attended meetings have occurred on May 9 and May 23, assegatherings are of value in the interchange of opinion.

Grundskild (Ground Rent), organ of the Danish Land Values Comittee, reports an interview with the Prime Minister early in the ring of this year. The deputation, led by Mr. F. Folke, urged the vernment to extend and develop the land-values tax for both state d local purposes. The reply was that the ministry was in accord to the sentiments expressed by the deputation, and that it was in amony with the views of the Land Values Committee. Mr. Dahlard, the Home Minister, in the upper house spoke against the prosal to reduce the taxes on landed property, saying that this would a free gift to the larger land owners and no relief to the smaller ner, since the latter would have heavier burdens piled on them.

A. G. Huie, editor of the *Standard*, Single Tax organ of New South ales, wants copies of anything written by Dr. McGlynn that were used in pamphlet form. Many of our readers will remember "The oss of the New Crusade," which was widely circulated but which now out of print. If any of our readers have anything to send to Huie he will be glad to receive it. His address is 114 Hunter set, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

NE have received from Charles J. Schoales, of Philadelphia, Pa., 8-page booklet giving the economic story in rather novel form and training much dietary advice, the value of which we are unable to ge. Its title is "Uncontrolled Earth and Birth." Mr. Schoales found completion of the little book that the rates asked for printing were much for him to meet, so he bought an old press at a bargain and the pages himself—rather an amazing feat for an amateur printer! Schoales' address is 2535 North Mascher Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

HE Fabreeka Belting Company, of Boston, Mass., in a beautifully ated business circular reprints the admirable "skit" by Samuel aziger on "Overproduction," and also the recent pronouncement resident Butler of Columbia on "Progress and Poverty."

R GEORGE FOWLDS writes us from Auckland: "Everything in New land is pretty bad and growing worse. No ideas beyond balancing budget by salary cuts and increased taxation. \* \* \* In Great tain it looks as if they will need another Cobden to lead them into land of freedom, and it will need a leader who will put free land n in front of free trade. \* \* Your paper has done and is doing d work."

HE death of John W. Lovell recalls one of the first publishers of ogress and Poverty" in the well-known 20-cent edition. He lat the age of eighty. Besides publishing Henry George's books sued 20-cent editions of Kipling, Barrie and Mrs. Humphry Ward. ell's Library, a sequence of standard works, was well known in the They were entered as second-class mail and had an enormous ulation. In 1889 his firm was absorbed by the United States Book pany, and in 1893 he retired from the publishing business and ited himself to real estate. Three daughters and one son survive. During his later years he occupied an apartment in the same with Morris Van Veen, and they were great friends.

RED SKIRROW, secretary of the Yorkshire and Northern Land les League (England), writes under date of April 30:

After all the good work done in promoting the cause of freedom were yet far from entering the promised land. But the only way to it to follow the trail blazed by Henry George and his followers; who the only people who know what they want and how to get it."

RE Cleveland Press speaks of Peter Witt's recent address at the Club of Cleveland, and noted elsewhere in this issue, says: "It

was quite a triumph. In substance it was not so much a discussion of the issues of the moment as a fundamental declaration of faith, the faith of a free trader and Single Taxer. And it was an eloquent declaration."

Miss Catharine Caldwell spoke on Henry George at the Hotel Jermyn, Scranton, Pa.

FROM a recent letter of John Paul, editor of Land and Liberty, of London, we extract the following:

"Let me congratulate you on the March-April Land and Freedom. As usual, it-carries good and useful instruction. I regret I have no time to name the pieces of writing that specially appeal to me. Apart from the special articles, which are all first-rate, the report of the field work has a revival touch about it that is calculated to bring new life into the 'valley of the dry bones' anywhere. I am a diligent reader of Land and Freedom and, like Comrade Frank Stephens, appreciate very much your own editorial notes and comments. I enjoyed particularly your "City Management—And After" article. The point of your criticism is surely in the last paragraph."

The Philosophy Club of the University of North Dakota was addressed recently by Dr. George R. Geiger, son of Oscar H. Geiger, his subject being "Moral Philosophy and the Social Sciences." In the columns of the *Quarterly Journal of Philosophy* young Dr. Geiger reviews "The Contemporary and His Soul," by Irwin Edman. The review has the usual sure and scholarly touch never lacking in anything written by this remarkable young man.

ERNEST G. GEOGHEGAN writes us from the island of Malta, where he is the leader or the Land Tax League. A petition of 755 names has been presented to the government of Malta and a promise received that the petition will be laid before the government after the forthcoming election. At every labor meeting a speaker is allotted for the land-value tax, and the result of the election is awaited with interest.

The Henry George League of New Jersey offers free lectures by the following well-known public speakers: James G. Blauvelt, manufacturer and former member of the New Jersey Legislature—subject, "Property Taxes and How to Relieve Them;" L. R. Bonta, tax expert—subject, "The Pittsburgh Tax Plan;" Alfred N. Chandler, publicist and economist—subject, "How to Abolish Poverty" (this lecture illustrated with stereopticon views); Hon. George L. Record, former member of the New Jersey State Board of Taxation and former city counsel of Jersey City—subject, "Business Depressions, Their Cause and How to Prevent Them;" Herman B. Walker, publicist, economist and newspaper writer—subject, "Individualism vs. Communism." These lectures are given without cost to organizations making requests of Herman B. Walker, 1726 Lefcourt Building, Newark, N. J.

WE regret to chronicle the death of Mrs. A. E. Schalkenbach, wife of Albert Schalkenbach, brother of Robert Schalkenbach. Mrs. Schalkenbach was greatly beloved by all who knew her. She died at a Chicago sanitarium where she had gone for treatment. Mr. Schalkenbach is comforted to reflect that the last few months of her life were comparatively free from pain.

THE People's Advocate, of Adelaide, Australia, contains an interesting account of the campaign of E. J. Craigie, M. P., to help the Tasmanian workers in their battle for the Single Tax and Free Trade. He addressed meetings in churches, chambers of commerce, and gatherings of factory workers. It is an inspiring record of the itinerary of this great crusader.

THE Rev. Alson H. Robinson, of the First Unitarian Church of Plainfield, N. J., writes to our friend H. B. Maurer: "Thank you most

heartily for sending me a copy of the Single Tax magazine Land and Freedom, which contains some excellent articles bearing upon our present critical situation."

Mrs. Daniel Kiefer, widow of Daniel Kiefer, of Fels Fund fame, and sister of Samuel Danziger, passed away on April 2 at Takoma Park, Md. She leaves three sons. Mrs. Kiefer was a convinced Single Taxer and did much work for the cause in the days when Mr. Kiefer was alive. She was approaching seventy.

"Your Archimedes booklet is a winner," writes Prof. Brinsmade.

"You are putting out such an interesting magazine that no George man can afford not to read it," is the verdict of William Matthews, of Spokane, Wash.

"C. B." WRITES to the New York Sun stating that the city of Vancouver, B. C., tried out the Single Tax with disastrous results. As the Single Tax was really not tried out in Vancouver or anywhere else, the writer is in error. The approach to it was negatived by ridiculously low assessments at a 20-mill rate. Not enough land values were taken to prevent the land speculation boom that set in—and of this no less a person than Henry George, Jr., warned the city long in advance. Had an honest attempt been made to carry out the principle in practice, the result would have been different. We hailed it at the time as a beginning, but for the reasons stated our hopes were blasted.

EDWIN I. S. HARDING, honorary secretary of the Henry George League of Queensland, writes: "The old hands are passing out all over the world. We need to pray the Lord of the Harvest that He will send forth young laborers into His fields—and we must do our share toward instructing and inspiring them."

"THE Fundamental Principles of Economics" is a thirty-five-page pamphlet published by Charles T. Townsend and Walter L. Sinton, at 2951 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif. It is excellent in matter and manner.

THE Lansing (Mich.) Capital News contains a rather lengthy report of an address by Ray Robson in which the merits of the Single Tax are set forth. Mr. Robson is president of the Single Tax Club formed in Lansing, which is gaining in numbers. The article is accompanied by a portrait of Mr. Robson. There are few workers in the movement who are doing more or better work then Mr. Robson and his devoted wife.

J. H. FLETCHER is a Methodist local preacher of Richmond, Australia. He has been disciplined by the church for a Single Tax speech in which he declared that the landless, rather than starve, offer to work for a bare, meagre living, which is all the black slave received. Hence the church's condemnation. We are pleased to know that all Methodists are not like, that and glad to record on the authority of our old friend W. L. Crosman, of Revere, Mass., that a book entitled "Religion in Everyday Life," by Harold B. Hunting, being a teachers' Sunday school manual, and used in Methodist Sunday schools, contains a story about Henry George and one about Tom L. Johnson. The one about the former refers to the time he wrote "Progress and Poverty," and the one about Mr. Johnson relates his struggles to make Cleveland "a city set upon a hill."

CLEMENT L. COLEMAN is dead at the age of eighty. He was one of Fairhope's pioneers and served for two years as member of the Fairhope Town Council. He is survived by his wife and two children, Genevieve and Henry George Coleman. He was long a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM.

JOHN F. CONROY, of Youngstown, O., appeared before the conmission appointed by the Governor to consider the question of unenployment insurance and advocated that a tax on land values be use to raise the necessary funds.

A SUBSCRIBER and sympathizer with our cause asks why, if the principle for which we contend is so vital, that it has not made great progress. The question may not be easy to answer, but it must remembered that arrayed against us are all the forces that opposing change. These, and the ignorance and apathy of the people, a sufficient explanation of the apparent slowness with which we move but we move just the same.

A DEBATE was held at Pacific Grove, Calif., in the high school auc torium between Hon. Jackson H. Ralston and Von T. Elsworth of t Pacific Grove Tribune. The Tribune was generous enough to head report of the debate with the caption, "Honors Are Even." In t course of his address Mr. Ralston said:

"Taxation should not be taxation at all. It should be a retu for benefits given. Government gives a series of benefits to all merbers of the community, such as schools, public buildings, police a fire protection. We have a very clear measure of these benefits. is economic rent, the earning power of land. No one man gave laits value. The whole body of you in the community have given val to the land. It is this which the government, as its creator, I a right to take. If that were done there would be a perfect exchan with benefits on both sides, because the measure of the service of government is accurately reflected in land values."

HON. JOHN F. DORE has been elected Mayor of Seattle by the larg vote ever given for that office in the city's history. Mr. Dore made subject of taxation the principal issue of his campaign. In the sa city Mr. Oliver T. Erickson, our old-time Single Tax friend, was defeat for the membership in the City Council. Mr. Dore writes Mr. P. Ryan as follows: "I was very much pleased with the letter I receive from you during the campaign. I am a great admirer of Henry Geo and am very familiar with his principles laid down in 'Progress a Poverty.'" In taking office Mayor Dore advocated a \$4,000 exempt of homes and criticized such fortunes as that of the Wendels,

DR. HARRY ELMER BARNES in the World-Telegram of this city reviethe life of Samuel Seabury by Walter Chambers and calls it "a capa and lucid biography." He suggests a parallel to the career of Jus Seabury in the life of another great Democrat, Samuel J. Tilden.

COMMENTING on the run-down condition of the high school in Welley, Mass., where he lives, Franklin Wentworth writes in the lopaper, *The Townsman:* "We should instruct our assessors to added to two to the valuation of all our land values in Wellesley, regarding the improvements. The land value is here. It is who a community value and should be taken for community purpose

Thus Mrs. Walter Ferguson in the World-Telegram: "Every mot would like to give her child plenty of outdoor room for play, but few have this because landlords have decided to make money from apment houses and we prize ground too highly." We ask Mrs. Fergu to think a little further, as she is on the right track, though perha little bewildered.

"LAND AND FREEDOM continues to bring its cheering message weach issue, and is indeed looked for," writes Mrs. W. D. Donalds of Gowanda, N. Y.

An admirable study of Newton D. Baker appears in *Colliers* of Ma 19. It is written by George Creel. Speaking of Tom L. Johnshe says: "That dynamic Saul of Tarsus, converted by Henry Geoffrom a career of money-making, had been elected Mayor of Clevel

1901. \* \* \* Johnson's need was for idealistic youth that he

FRANK H. Howe, of Columbus, O., is candidate in the primaries for unty Commissioner.

THE movement has suffered a loss in the death of Frank Grant, of stifield, Mass. He died at the Springfield hospital, where he had as for a minor operation. He was a member of the family of which S. Grant was the most distinguished member, and was much inested in the genealogy of the Grants, beginning with the founder the family, Matthew Grant, of Windsor, Conn. He possessed an imate knowledge and had a great fund of anecdote relating to local tory. The Springfield papers referred to him as "a nationally known thority on Single Tax." He was present at the Henry George ngress in Baltimore last year.

THE State convention of the Socialist party of California, which in February, adopted a plank calling for the taxation of the annual tal value of all land held for speculation, a recommendation imposse of enforcement but nevertheless a slight hint of the recognition he importance of the land question.

MARK SULLIVAN heads one of his articles in the Herald Tribune, mocrats Talk Free Trade and Act for Tariff." They do not even free trade. Something would be gained for education if they did that.

is hard to keep track of the activities of John C. Rose, of Pittsth, Pa., so many and varied are they. Many of the letters appearin newspapers under different noms de plume are his.

ALDO J. WERNICKE sent to the Catholic Tidings a criticism of the kers and real estate speculators of Los Angeles, which was hospittreated by Rev. John Dunne, its editor. He has also sent much rry George literature to Rev. Robert E. Lucy, well-known liberal tor of St. Anthony's Church (Catholic) of Long Beach, Calif. her Lucey's radio talks have aroused much interest because of their ent and tolerant spirit. They have endeared him to thousands of the spirit. Mr. Wernicke received a gracious reply from this forwarding priest. It is splendid work that Mr. Wernicke is doing in his ty letters to the papers and to individuals.

ROF. LEROY WATERMAN, of the University of Michigan, reports that is excavations at Seleucia on the Tigress he found seals indicating a rich citizen of that ancient capital had not paid his taxes for aty-five years. He had saved the tablets at six months' intervals ng that period. "A situation not uncommon in many communitoday," added the professor, dryly.

DHN B. McGAURAN, of Denver, writes: "I am glad to see that the fornians have discarded the term Single Tax. It is contradictory misleading and has been the cause o much confusion and miserstanding. Henry George said it was a misnomer. It is worse that."

. H. BOECK, of St. Louis, has written a letter to Father Coughlin, se radio talks have been strong arraignments of our civilization, ng attention to what the good father lacks in the apprehension of lamentals.

on. Charles O'Connor Hennessy during his recent visit of Cocoa, presented through the Schalkenbach Foundation, of which he resident, new editions of the works of Henry George, which were refully acknowledged by the librarian, John L. Paterson. The lent was noted in the columns of the Cocoa Tribune.

EDWARD P. E. TROY, of San Francisco, has been at Albuquerque, N. Mex., for six months assisting Attorney Robert La Follette in his case before the State Corporation Commission for nine thousand petitioners who ask for electric light and gas rate reduction. Mr. Troy is widely known as a qualified expert in these matters. In a recent letter to us Mr. Troy says: "Why not ask the Single Taxers what they are doing in the present crisis to save our national lands? If Congress gives the lands to the States they will be in the hands of monopolists, and the margin of cultivation will disappear, thus making American men and women more completely slaves."

STATEMENT of the Ownership, Management, Circulation, etc., required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, of LAND AND FREEDOM, published bi-monthly at New York, N. Y., for April I, 1932.

State of New York, County of New York, ss.:

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

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

Publisher: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., I50 Nassau Street, New York City.

Editor: Joseph Dana Miller, I50 Nassau St., New York City.

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

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

- 2. That the owners are: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., Herman G. Loew, Pres., George R. Macey, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, New York City. None but Joseph Dana Miller own one per cent. or more of stock.
- 3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.
- 4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stocks, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER,

EDITOR.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 22nd day of March, 1932.

[Seal] LOUIS D. SCHWARTZ, Notary Public

New York County.

# The Story of Archimedes

A terrible if ironlcal arraignment of Land Monopoly resurrected from the writings of Mark Twain (though the origin of its publication awaits identification).

Dan Beard, illustrator of Mark Twaln's "Yankee in King Arthur's Court," certifies his belief in its authenticity.

Here is the most trenchant indictment of Land Monopoly ever written. Coming from a friend of Henry George, this wonderful essay by Mark Twain, the most gifted satirist of his time, will be a surprise to those who know him only as the author of such widely differing works as "Huckleberry Finn" and "The Diary of Joan of Arc."

Issued as a 12-page pamphlet and sold at 5 cents a single copy and 2 cents each in quantities of ten or more.

ORDER OF

Single Tax Publishing Company 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

# Tracts

Single Copy
Plain Talk on Taxation, by James R. Brown 5c.
Farmer and Single Tax, by James R. Brown 5c.
Pyramiding of Land Values, by James R. Brown - 5c.
Not a Single Tax, by Charles T. Root 5c.
Taxing Land Values, by Henry George 5c.
Single Tax, What It Is and Why We Urge It, by Henry George 5c.
The Ultimate Causes of Unemployment, by Warren S. Blauvelt 5c.
Thoughts on Natural Law In Civil Life, by John H. Scully 5c.
Causes of Business Depression, by Charles G. Merrell 3c.
The Philosophy of the Single Tax, by James F. Morton 3c.
Better Than Socialism, by James F. Morton 5c.
Natural Law in the Economic World, by Oscar H. Geiger 5c.
LAND AND FREEDOM

150 Nassau Street

N. Y. C

# Unemployment and Our Revenue Problem

By JOHN S. CODMAN

A New Edition in Board Covers Price 25 cents

This book when it first appeared several years ago caused much favorable comment

ORDER OF

LAND AND FREEDOM

150 Nassau Street

New York City

# Henry George Schoo of Social Science

(Supported by friends of the movement)

Meets every Friday Evening at Pythian Temple

> 135 West 70th Street East of Broadway

New York City

Classes and Forums Questions and Discussion

OSCAR H. GEIGER, Director

Send the young folks