

September—October, 1932

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

A Friendly Letter to the B. E. F.

An Economist's Perplexities

Raymond V. McNally

The Coming Henry George Congress

Activities of the Henry George Lecture Association,
the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, the Manhattan Single Tax Club,
Correspondence, News Notes, Etc.

EARLY 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, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOWE, Pres., 170 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.

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1932

VOL. XXXII

No. 5, WHOLE No. 174

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

	PAGE
A FRIENDLY LETTER TO THE B. E. F.....The Editor	147
AN ECONOMISTS' PERPLEXITIES..Raymond V. McNally.	148
RENT AND PRICE.....L. D. Beckwith	154
REPLY TO L. D. BECKWITH.....Oscar H. Geiger	155
THE COMING HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS.....	158
MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB.....	160
HENRY GEORGE LECTURE ASSOCIATION.....	161
PRIZE ESSAY.....Theodore Lundmark	162
HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.....	165
ACTIVITIES OF THE SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION.....	167
DEATH OF CHAS. J. OGLE.....	168
SINGLE TAX ENCLAVES.....Address. Fiske Warren	169
BOOK NOTICE.....H. M. H	171
CORRESPONDENCE.....	172
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS	173

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

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

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

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

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

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

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

DL. XXXII

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1932

No. 5

A Friendly Letter to the B. E. F.

Walter W. Walters, Commander B. E. F.—*Dear Sir:*

YOU and your comrades fought for your country, only to find that none of it belonged to you. You were evicted from Washington by troops at the command of the government to whose call you responded in time of danger. Nothing was too good for you in the time of war. You will recall the patriotic speeches made in those days, and how everything was promised you. How the people applauded! You were sitting on top of the world.

YOUR eviction from Washington by armed forces was not the first eviction of which you and every landless man is the victim. That took place some time ago; that time antedates your eviction from Washington and is involved in the legislation that evicts you from the earth, that makes you a trespasser in the land you fought for. You served your country, but to enjoy the use of any part of it you must bargain with some one of your fellowmen. If you would find a foothold on which to build yourself and family a home you must seek out some one who was there before you. To him you must pay rent or purchase-price for the permission to live. Is this the "equality of opportunity" of which President Hoover speaks in his address of acceptance of his Presidential nomination?

In the meantime what do you see? You see groups coming to Washington by every train seeking alms for favored industries in which they or their constituents are interested. These tariff beneficiaries are accompanied by banking and railroad lobbyists, all the heterogeneous collection seeking government favors. Were they evicted from the Capital? They were not. They were welcomed to the White House; they were not compelled to camp out; they stayed at the best hotels.

ALL that, of course, is an accident of conditions. There can be no objection to any of these gentlemen who seek government favors stopping at high-priced hotels. Some of them were able to do this because they were in receipt of government favors. But that again is an accident of conditions—a mere consequence with which we need not be seriously concerned.

It is with some hesitancy I touch upon what seems to many the weakness of the bonus demand. You were

placed in the position of demanding what seems like class legislation. I know the defense and realize its strength. Surely, runs the argument, those who risked their lives when persuaded their country was in danger have a real claim to demand relief. The government has no money save what it takes from you and me. If you had demanded for yourselves that an ancient wrong be righted you would have had, of course, a real claim. But not a prior claim. Others grown to manhood since the war would as cheerfully respond to a call for their country's defense and are in the same position as yourself and your fellows of the B. E. F. They, too, are unemployed and hungry.

I KNOW it is hard. It is an incident charged with bitter irony that must sink deep into your hearts. In France you met the "Huns"—how strange now seems that epithet reviewed in the abysmal insanity of the World War! Yet this, too, is only an accident of conditions. You saw in Washington your former comrades coming at you just like the "Huns" with charging bayonets! Suppose you had been told twelve years ago that this would happen. How insane would have seemed such a prediction!

WHAT I am seeking to impress upon you is that the answer to your problem must besought fundamentally. The plight of the ex-service men is but one angle of the problem demanding a solution. "My Country, 'tis of Thee" can be sung until men are hoarse without making it true. You know it is not true. The country belongs to less than ten per cent of the people, and the percentage is much less when land is considered according to value. Everywhere you turn you find the land preempted. Does it not seem that a joke—a very serious joke, however—has been perpetrated upon you?

AND then thinking further on the question, is not the conviction borne in on you that your condition and that of millions of your fellow countrymen is due to the denial of the right to the use of the earth? What does employment mean—how is it brought about? Is it possible to save by application, direct or indirect, of labor to land? If the land is sequestered, or if excessive payment for its use is demanded, then labor is unemployed. That is what has happened to produce this depression.

THERE is a remedy, of course, because for every social ill there must be a remedy. It lies in the taking of the

annual rent of land for public purposes, thus preventing speculation in land, opening up the earth and getting millions back to work. It is so simple that some distrust it who want complex solutions of simple problems. It can be done tomorrow, not without a shock, they tell us. But if it be just we can risk a shock. Perhaps the Communists will get in ahead of us. That would be somewhat more of a shock.

I SAY if it be just. Land is as necessary to life as air. It is impossible to argue that one man has more right to air than another. It is equally impossible to argue that he has more right to land than another. Land differs from air only in this particular—some of it is occupied or appropriated to exclusive use. How shall the right of every man to the land be established? Happily we are provided with a solution. Land has value as population arises. This value is known as economic rent, and is in proportion to the demand for the use of land. And as it increases with every social service it yields itself admirably to the needs of revenue. Its appropriateness for revenue is obvious from many angles.

AND this revenue would enable us to abolish all taxes. Every piece of land having value would then be available for use. And under such conditions there would be no such thing as unemployment. Improvements being exempt from taxation nearly every citizen would benefit, for he would have less taxes to pay. Those who are holders of large tracts of unimproved land, even though their taxes would be increased, would benefit by living in a better civilization where they and their children would no longer be threatened by insecurity, and in which men and women would be free from want and the fear of want. It would make every other reform easier. Disease and crime would be sensibly diminished; government would be simplified and its cost reduced. In every way society would benefit and forces be unloosed for social advance. And then "My Country, 'tis of Thee" would be a truism and not a stupid lie!

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

ANNUAL taxes of \$13,000,000,000 are crushing industry. Even some Congressmen and Senators see that. But the effect on industry of \$13,000,000,000 of economic rent is such that not a single Congressman or Senator considers it worth mentioning. Could there be more eloquent testimony that taking economic rent for public use in lieu of taxes would be an enormous improvement? Why should not the biggest ignoramuses concerning taxation principles—there are over 400 of these in the House, over 90 in the Senate—see that much? Now let those who have been bearing witness so long by their silence prove by their votes that they have the courage of their convictions.

HE [Henry George] was as guileless as a child and as earnest as a martyr.—WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

An Economist's Perplexities

THE world has lost a great teacher. The man who doubtless has succeeded more than any political economist of the century to spread a knowledge of the science of political economy was Charles Gide of France. This famous economist died in March of this year. He was an honorary professor at the Paris Law School and professor at the College of France at the time of his death. His principal work was his "Principles of Political Economy," which has been very widely used in France, England and America as a college text-book. It was first published about half a century ago and has gone through at least eight editions in the original French and has been translated into the Russian, Swedish, Dutch, Finnish, Polish, Spanish, Bohemian and English languages.

In commenting on his death, one of the leading financial and economic and political dailies of Paris, *L'Informateur*, remarked that this work was "an authority in the economic world as a model of clearness of method and easy, agreeable and captivating reading." Gide himself wrote in the preface to the eighth edition: "What I have endeavored is to give a general description rather than an analysis of the economic world—of the vast domain in which we live and move without knowing very well whither we are going. I have sought to arouse curiosity and interest in economic problems rather than always to furnish cut-and-dried solutions. I have tried not so much to convey absolute conviction based on scientific laws that are still imperfectly understood, as to impart a sincere and fervid desire to discover the truth. I have, moreover, tried to make political economy, which France has long borne (without much protestation) the name of tedious literature, appear to the beginner as an attractive and captivating subject."

The science of political economy, after having lain almost as a dead thing for probably half a century, has now showing signs of taking a new lease on life. The reason for it is not hard to find. It touches the life of every man, woman and child. The larger part of our time is taken up with efforts to make a living. Economics is the very foundation of our lives. It treats of the nature of wealth and the laws governing its production and distribution. These laws are not made by man, but by nature, and we must for our own benefit seek these laws. Since 1929, interest has been revived in the science, due to the disruption of the economic system, previously deemed impregnable, which has made men realize that their contempt of economic science was a result of their own ignorance.

It is appropriate, therefore, at this time, that attention should be directed to a man who has held a position of prominence in the economic world and who has impressed so many people with his views. Then again, it was the countrymen of this man, the Physiocrats, who first founded the science in the middle of the eighteenth century. He owed a great deal to Quesnay, Turgot and

that school. Mistakes they made, but a braver and more honest set of economists the world has never known. While there is little doubt that Gide succeeded in inspiring a sincere desire to discover the truth, there is no question that he did not succeed entirely in his attempt to provide an analysis of economic problems and convey absolute convictions. In his "Principles of Political Economy," and also in "History of Economic Doctrines," the latter work written by him in collaboration with Charles Rist, he analyzed the various theories and in a number of cases admitted definite opinions. With his convictions in connection with principles that have been generally accepted are not concerned. It is his analyses and positive conclusions dealing with disputed questions which mainly interest us.

The cause of crises and the cause of poverty are the burning questions of the day and should be found in a study of the distribution of wealth. We have economists springing up among us at the present time, who are agitating for a planned economy. Their energies are concentrated entirely on the production of wealth, ignoring the problem of its distribution, or believing in some vague way that if production is planned properly, an equitable distribution will naturally follow.

Gide said that economic crises varied in length and intensity, and while there might be various reasons ascribed to them, it was possible to find a common fundamental cause, such as the sudden disturbance of the economic equilibrium, either in production of many commodities or in the production of a single very important commodity, such as wheat, capital, metallic money or credit instruments. In each of these cases the disturbance is due to a glut or scarcity of goods. Now, he stated that while it would seem that a scarcity of goods was much more dangerous than a superabundance, the latter was more dreaded, except in the case of a superabundance of money. He went on to say that development of large-scale production, modern inventions and means of transportation have enabled industry to produce such a large supply of products on the market that consumption cannot always keep pace with production. He did not mean that more things were produced than people could afford, but that more were produced than people were able to buy. This is difficult to understand when we know that consumers are also producers. As people produce, they can consume. Their consuming or purchasing power springs from their ability to produce. Charles Rist, Gide's collaborator, held this view in "History of Economic Doctrines." He wrote therein that the growth of production created demand and did not agree with the general overproduction theory.

Overproduction can exist only in a relative sense. There is relative overproduction when the production of certain commodities is in excess of their proper proportion to the production of other commodities. This may occur either through an increase in production of those commodities or through a decrease in production of the other commodities. If there

was an increase in production of some commodities, Gide claimed, producers would be obliged to lower their prices and to reduce their output for a while. This fall in prices would mean lower profits or failures for the employers and lower wages or loss of work for the laborers. He overlooked the fact that, in a free market, the prices of those commodities could fall without decreasing production. If prices fell, consumers could buy more of those commodities and more of other commodities. This would stimulate production of the other commodities, resulting in an increased demand for the first group of commodities. Thus, production would be increased in all directions and the equilibrium between the production of the first group and the production of the second group would be re-established.

Gide agreed that the proportionate increase in the production of the other commodities would re-establish the equilibrium between supply and demand, but he believed that this had to take place simultaneously in all branches of industry. The fact of the matter is that it does take place simultaneously if no restrictions are placed on the production of the other commodities. No matter how much production increases in some industries, if production in other industries decreases in even greater ratio, demand for the commodities produced by the first group of industries would be lessened and there would be relative overproduction. As I said before, relative overproduction can take place either by an increase in production or a decrease in production; but while these causes might produce similar effects to a limited extent and only in particular industries, the general effects will be entirely different. For instance, let us suppose that the automobile manufacturers, in order to raise prices, agreed among themselves to reduce production. Many men immediately would be thrown out of work. Their demand for other commodities would fall off, resulting in a decrease in production in other industries, more unemployment and reduced purchasing power. As a result of this reduced purchasing power, the check in production at this point would be transmitted to all industries and culminate in a general stagnation of business, unemployment, poverty, crime and vice. When the equilibrium had again been established, it would be on a lower level of production. Thus, we see that an increase in production of any commodity tends to stimulate trade in all industries, while a decrease in production of any commodity tends to diminish trade in all industries.

Even though a proportionate increase may take place in production in all branches of industry, if money is scarce prices will fall. However, as Gide pointed out, an increase in the supply of money will restore the equilibrium. While money panics are to be greatly feared, Gide admitted that there were always definite signs that heralded their approach and enabled us to avert them.

He believed that a proportionate increase would not always take place simultaneously in all industries. While he did not appear fully to realize that this was due to obstructions being placed in the path of free competition,

precluding a more or less smooth return to stability, he pointed out, in the case of the international exchange of goods, that a tariff would act as an impediment to a proportionate increase in foreign goods that would prevent a re-establishment of the equilibrium. If we realize that there are just as serious impediments to domestic trade as there are to foreign trade, we can see that the cause of crises is due not to an abnormal increase in production of some commodities but to a decrease in production of other commodities in even greater proportion.

We have never enjoyed really free competition because of the unnatural restrictions on trade. While some industries are enjoying comparatively unrestricted production, other industries are burdened by cartels, combines, labor unions, price agreements and heavy taxation. While Gide recognized the benefits of competition, he considered them as being greatly outweighed by the evils. According to him, competition was a kind of warfare which meant the triumph of the strong and the ruin of the weak, and did not necessarily cause an equalization of profits and of wealth. It tended to destroy itself by giving rise to monopolies, and then the government would step in to regulate them by laws and taxes. This would lead, he said, to collectivism or state socialism. "We can very well conceive," he concluded, "and we are already beginning to realize a system in which mutual agreement—between workmen and employers through the medium of organizations of both and between producers and consumers by means of co-operative associations—will do away with most of the evils of competition without placing free enterprise under the yoke of governmental regulation."

Gide was the promoter of the co-operative movement in France. The work he has left in connection with it is considerable. He has written theoretical works on the subject, pamphlets of propaganda, and books and articles to diffuse knowledge relating to it.

When Gide claimed that competition did not necessarily cause an equalization of profits and of wealth, he betrayed a false conception of equality. Equality does not mean a term applied to a condition in which men share more or less alike, in which the strong and able are penalized in favor of the weak. Equality is the term applied to a condition in which all men have the same opportunity, limited only by their own defections, to gratify their desires. If one man possesses powers superior to those of other men, the principle of equal rights demands that he be permitted the full use of those powers provided he does not infringe the equal right of other men to the full use of their powers. Only in free competition, allowing men to satisfy their desires with the least expenditure of exertion, can these rights be maintained. This is the only basis of true capitalism.

The object of co-operation, it appears, is not to abolish private property but to make it more general by facilitating the acquisition of private capital either by saving or bor-

rowing and to create co-operative property or collective ownership of stores, banks, factories and houses. It aims to withhold that part of the product that capital appropriates in the form of profits and dividends. Many co-operative associations are expressly forbidden by their constitutions to make any profits or are compelled to place them into a reserve fund. The co-operative theory is based on the false assumption that inequalities are due to competition. Curiously enough, those supporting co-operation use the same means to gain their end as men who, desiring to profit at the expense of others, strive in every way possible to restrict competition by gaining some privileged monopoly. The mercantile system in England during the eighteenth century is an example of how economic laws were violated for selfish reasons. Practically the same system exists today in almost every country under the name of protectionism.

Co-operation, as proposed by Gide and others, means simply taking the line of least resistance and is almost identical to economic planning that seems to be the rage nowadays. Instead of fighting restrictions on economic laws, which many people evidently seems a hopeless task, the idea is to swing along with the tide and add even more restrictions. It amounts to a mild form of socialism, and that is what it would probably end up, if applied generally.

Men cannot utilize their powers to the highest possible degree, where intelligence is required, if they are subject to the will of others. There is bound to be loss of productive power. When intelligence or directing ability is not required of the many, co-operation is necessary whereby many are subject to the will of one, as in the case of an army. The production of wealth, however, requires that many. A large part, be permitted individual thought and action. There is a tendency throughout the entire world today, even though remote, toward the dissipation of productive power and efficiency. As society progressed, specialization and division of labor steadily increased so that each man has learned to do one thing well, thus increasing the aggregate productive power. In this way, too, each nation has confined its activities to the particular lines of endeavor in which it has been best fitted, so that through the exchange of services and goods with one another they have all been able to satisfy their desires to much better advantage than when they were self-supporting and absolutely independent of each other. However, the steady and persistent erection of tariff barriers that we see going on all over the world today, that prevent the free exchange of goods, is compelling all countries to diversify their activities and to become dependent on each other. To such an extent has this movement been proceeding, that some of the States in this country have caught the fever and are striving to isolate themselves. They are forbidden by the Constitution to erect tariff laws, but they have been showing marked preference for goods produced by their own industries in various ways such as placing high taxes on goods from other States.

within their borders. It may be beyond the realms of imagination to conceive that, if this sort of thing continues far enough and long enough, modern civilization will be returned to a primitive condition in which each man is a jack-of-all-trades, satisfying all of his wants himself; but, nevertheless, there is a tendency in that direction.

Co-operative systems and economic planning, by their violation of natural laws, are definitely contributing to this backward movement. It is the inability or unwillingness on the part of so many economists to probe deeply enough in their analyses of causes that weakens their faith in the laws of their own science and moves them to propose all sorts of schemes to prevent their natural operation. If restrictions on competition prevent a proportionate increase in production taking place in some industries to offset an abnormal increase in production in other industries and to restore the equilibrium, the logical remedy is not further to stifle competition but to lift all restrictions and to permit the free interplay of supply and demand.

Gide said that crises of a more serious nature were caused by a scarcity or glut in the factors of production rather than by a scarcity or glut of commodities. The three factors of production, we know, are land, labor and capital. Sometimes there is not enough labor or capital for the land that is available, or not enough land to afford employment to labor and capital. Now, while he seemed to stress the overabundance of capital as causing disturbances, this does not seem possible if there is sufficient land available upon which this capital can be applied. Land cannot be decreased or increased by man. Its quantity is fixed. It is the most important factor in production because man depends on it for his very existence. Everything he has came from the land. Not only is it essential to the farmer, but it is essential to every business man in the towns and cities who requires locations for his factories, offices and salesrooms. Too much land is not disturbing, but too little is. If there is not enough available for the needs of man, he suffers, and this suffering in organized society is called a business depression.

Although a good deal of land in the world is still unappropriated, most of the desirable land is privately owned. Especially is this true in highly civilized, progressive countries. The institution of private property in land has existed for centuries and centuries, almost from the beginning of civilization. While land today is considered wealth, it is not wealth in the economic sense. Economic wealth means natural products or products from land that have been removed or modified by labor. Land is not created by labor. It differs from wealth, according to Gide, in three ways: (1) It provides for the satisfaction of human wants that are essential and permanent. (2) It is limited in quantity. (3) It lasts forever.

Land yields rent. According to Gide, the law of rent has been one of the most disturbing problems to economists,

and it was not until Ricardo invented his famous theory of land-rent in the early part of the nineteenth century that political economy was able to throw any real light on the subject. His theory gave rise to many discussions and controversies, however. Some economists deny that land yields a return. They claim that the revenue from land is nothing but the product of capital put into the land by its owner or his predecessors. Gide said this idea was not generally accepted, and seemed to be inspired really by a desire to justify and defend property in land.

The law of rent, as laid down by Ricardo, is this: Rent is the excess of the produce of land over that which the same application of labor and capital can secure from the least productive land in use. When a country is first settled, there is an abundance of rich and fertile land. Only a small part of it is needed in the beginning for the satisfaction of the wants of the few settlers. Land then will yield no rent until population increases which will require the cultivating of land of inferior quality, that is, land on which the cost of production is higher. As population continues to increase, the margin of cultivation is lowered, more inferior land being brought into use, and rent rises. Rent, then, is the expression of the advantage that land possesses over land that is least productive. While Ricardo had in mind agricultural land when he discovered this law, it can be and is applied to industrial land also. Rent on the latter actually increases in greater proportion.

The ownership of land, therefore, gives the power of appropriating that part of the wealth produced by capital and labor that exceeds the return which an equal amount of capital and labor could obtain on the least productive land or, what amounts to the same thing, in the least productive occupation. Gide considered land-rent the result of a monopoly and that this rent was bound to increase in consequence of social forces entirely beyond the influence of the landlord. He expressed the opinion that, in strict justice, society as a whole should own all the land, but that society could not promote the interests of all better than by delegating this right to those who could make the best use of the land. In other words, in spite of the injustice done to the many, social utility or expediency demanded that there should be private ownership of land. What kind of political economy is it that cannot be reconciled with ethics? Was Gide not somewhat confused as to the real meaning of social expediency? Does not the best kind of expediency lie in justice? Certain philosophers and economists persist in the intentional misuse of the term with a definite purpose in mind. They attempt to justify the existence and continuance of unjust institutions on the ground of social expediency, when it is apparent to all thoughtful people that they are maintained for the few and not for the many. This may have led to Gide's misconception of the term and caused him to link it carelessly with injustice.

Gide recognized the equal right of all men to the use of

the earth, the principle so ably expounded by Herbert Spencer, but was puzzled as to how this right could be secured. He said that if property in land be based only on reasons of social utility, it would have been sufficient to confine the right of property to the land to which labor had really been applied. Two-fifths of the area of France is uncultivated, he pointed out, but two-thirds of this land is privately owned. Gide was strongly against land owners who did not use the land themselves but merely played a passive part and collected the rent. Moreover, he was not in favor of the tenant system, because he felt that private property in land was necessary for the best utilization of the land. He believed that tenancy would gradually disappear and that owners themselves would eventually cultivate the land either individually or through partnerships or co-operation. That prediction is not finding realization in the United States. Each year sees the number of tenant farmers growing. Today, half of the farmers are tenants. Most economists believe in the private ownership of land and deplore this trend toward tenancy.

Gide held the view that private ownership naturally carried with it the private appropriation of land-rent, just as the legitimacy of interest was inseparable from that of private property in capital. This is inconsistent with his statement that land and capital are not at all similar. Capital is wealth that is used in the production of more wealth. Furthermore, he had ridiculed as childish the argument that because land has been bought, the rent of land was simply the interest on money thus invested. He said in his "Principles of Political Economy," "A piece of land does not yield a rent of \$4,000 because it was bought for \$100,000, but it sells for \$100,000 because it will yield \$4,000 rent independently of any labor on the part of the owner." Yet, strangely, he fell into the same "childish" error in the very same chapter.

In spite of occasional lapses in his reasoning, there is no doubt as to the definite trend his thoughts took. He put to rout the optimistic school that claimed the value of land and its growing surplus value were sufficiently explained by the improvements made in the land and the expenditure incurred by its owners. He pointed out very clearly that land was not valueless because it was uncultivated and unimproved, but because it was situated in a wild and uninhabited section. In some of the large cities in this country there is unused land, uncultivated, unimproved, that is worth millions of dollars. It is the presence and activities of the people that create this value.

If private ownership of land is unjust, it cannot be socially expedient. However, the best interests of society demand the private ownership of land so that users of the land will enjoy undisturbed possession of it. Therefore, the injustice must lie not in the private ownership of land but in the private ownership of land value. Gide did not recognize this distinction, because he believed that private

ownership should include the private appropriation of ground-rent. Some economists insist that land would not be properly improved by the owners if they were not permitted to appropriate the land-rent or unearned increment. This view is false in theory and in practice. The private appropriation of land-rent does not encourage the improvement of land. On the contrary, we see that it leads to the temptation to hold land out of use for speculative purposes. The claim that people would not have taken possession of land under the Homestead laws and cultivated it if they had not been permitted to realize on the unearned increment is absurd. The incentive to cultivate and improve the land was the opportunity to gain possession of it free from the government for the purpose of making a living on it. We must not lose sight of the fact that land is absolutely essential to the existence of the human race. It is not necessary to reward people for using land. The incentive to use it is the will to live. Everyone needs it, whether he be owner, tenant or laborer.

Gide said the surplus value of land was most striking in new countries, such as the United States, and that many of the great fortunes were largely due to the unearned increment from land. He felt that something should be done to bring about a more equitable condition and showed an inclination for the schemes of land nationalization. In an article that he wrote for the *Journal des Economistes* in July, 1883, he suggested that the State offer to buy the land and pay for it on the basis of ninety-nine years' purchase. This differed only slightly from John Stuart Mill's plan. Mill suggested that the State appropriate future rents of land, the rents paid after the reform had been accomplished. A general tax would effect this, but if a proprietor considered himself unfairly treated, the State would give him the option of paying the new tax or selling the land to the State at the price obtainable for it at the time of the reform. Like Mill, Gossen, Walras and Herbert Spencer, Gide knew he was on uncertain ground. In spite of the fact that he considered it unjust that the ownership of land permitted owners to reap an unearned benefit at the expense of the community, he regarded land nationalization as impracticable, particularly in respect of property in land already established. In sparsely settled countries, he thought it might be a comparatively simple matter for the State to establish its dominion over the land, but when population became dense and most of the land came under private ownership, private ownership became a monopoly. It was then, he said, too late to buy back the land.

Gide's attitude toward what he termed an injustice seemed to be one of futility and hopelessness. He shrank from the idea of public appropriation of land-rent by means of taxation and the abolition of all other taxes which was suggested by Patrick Edward Dove, the Scottish philosopher, in his book, "The Theory of Human Progression," published in 1850, and later explained more scientifically by Henry George in "Progress and Poverty

It was George, according to Gide, who developed the law of rent so "eloquently." George did not hold with Ricardo's pessimistic theory that rent was caused by the inability of increasing population of procuring more subsistence except at a greater cost which forced producers to lower and lower points of production. He pointed out that increase of population increased rent rather by increasing the productiveness of labor than by decreasing it. He showed that increasing population caused rent to rise not only by lowering the margin of cultivation but also by increasing the productiveness of particular lands—productiveness not in the sense of superior fertility but in the sense of superior utility given to these lands by good local government, transportation facilities, schools, colleges, libraries, museums, churches, art, music and the drama. Gide erred when he said that George held the theory that the "economic rent of land was due entirely to the growth of population." George showed that, irrespective of the increase in population, the effect of improvements in methods of production and exchange was to increase rent.

George claimed that as the production of wealth increased, rent increased, but wages due to labor and interest due to capital fell as a proportion of the whole produce. Incidentally, showing that, irrespective of the increase in population, the tendency of material progress was to lower wages and cause poverty, he completely discovered the Malthusian doctrine which attempted to explain poverty by claiming it was due to the increasing pressure of population against the means of subsistence. Wages and interest would not necessarily fall as a quantity but might even rise as a quantity. This accords with the natural growth of society. However, under the present system of private ownership of land which permits the private appropriation of land-rent, speculation in land values is encouraged. Thus land is continually being held out of use in expectation of a rise in value, and producers are therefore forced to lower and lower levels of production more quickly than are demanded by the natural needs of society. In this way, rent increases in greater ratio than the increase in productive power, and wages and interest not only fall as a proportion but as a quantity. We see this condition demonstrated most vividly in large cities. Then manufacturers, jobbers and retailers enjoy a readily increasing volume of business and become more prosperous, their rent is raised.

Now, the rent they are charged is of a dual nature. Part of it is for the building they occupy, but from the economic standpoint this merely comprises interest on the investment in the building. The other part is the rent for the land on which the building stands. It is this part that increases. This increase tends to swallow up the whole increase in production, so that these manufacturers, jobbers and retailers can receive no greater return for their investment and labor than can be obtained at the margin of production or in the least productive enterprise in which

they can freely engage. If rent swallows up more than the increase in production, producers are finally compelled to stop producing, and this culminates in industrial crises. Speculation in land, then, appears to be the greatest restriction on free competition that creates the phenomena commonly characterized as "overproduction."

Frequently we observe that real wages and the return on capital do increase as a quantity as productive power increases. George explained this by stating that it was due to rent increasing in a smaller ratio than the increase in productive power. In other words, the lowering of the margin of cultivation lags behind the increase in productive power, depending on the area of productiveness that can be utilized before producers are forced to the next lower level. However, in a period of intense speculation in land the tendency is not to lag behind. While we notice occasionally, as the wealth of the country grows, that a good part of it falls into the hands of individuals who are not land owners, the general return to capital and labor is not increased. It does not seem to occur to business men to wonder why, in spite of the numerous inventions and improvements that have taken place during the past fifty years, immeasurably increasing productive power, the return to capital has made no material advance.

As a result of his explanation of poverty, George recommended the encouragement of the production of wealth by abolishing all taxes that bore on production and placing taxes solely on the value of land. By removing taxes from the product of labor and capital and preventing the private appropriation of land-rent, he contended that a more equitable distribution of wealth would be effected. Gide's countrymen, the Physiocrats, proposed the same thing about a hundred and fifty years ago. Gide's chief objection to it lay in his assertion that the value of land was due not only to social causes but to improvement of the land by the land owner. He felt that in taxing the value due to social causes, the value due to improvements might also be taxed. This would not be just and would discourage private initiative and enterprise. He considered the separation of these two elements impossible. Anticipating such an objection, George wrote: "Admitting that it is impossible invariably to separate the value of land from the value of improvements, is this necessity of continuing to tax some improvements any reason why we should continue to tax all improvements? If it discourage production to tax values which labor and capital have intimately combined with that of land, how much greater discouragement is involved in taxing not only these but all the clearly distinguishable values which labor and capital create?"

We are not at all certain, however, that the value of land cannot always be distinguished from the value of the improvements. Usually, in assessing real estate, these values are separated. If improvements had been made on land many years ago and had become so blended with the land

as to be considered a part of it, to tax them now would not discourage future improvements. Today, improvements made on land, leased for that purpose, revert to the land owner on the expiration of the lease.

Another objection made by Gide was that if society profited by all gains in the value of land, on the ground that they were due to no exertion or sacrifice on the part of the owner, it should, in justice to him, make good all losses arising from the decreased value due to social causes. This hardly seems worthy of Gide's analytical abilities. If the owner used the land he would not suffer, because then his tax would be smaller. However, if he speculated in land he would lose. We know that Gide was unalterably opposed to land owners who did not use their land themselves for productive purposes. His defense of land speculators, then, indicates how badly muddled he was at this point in his analysis. It is evident that he did not realize fully to what extent the speculation in land held land out of use. He believed that the present popular and legal conception of land as property permitted the easy transferability of land which he considered beneficial to society. He thought that when millions of people, as in the United States, had the opportunity of sharing in this monopoly of land, the evils were minimized. On the contrary, they are intensified. This easy transferability has led to terrific speculation, sending land values to abnormal heights and making it difficult for producers to obtain access to land.

Gide claimed that taxation of rent would amount to confiscation of the land itself, and that owners should be compensated. While it appears unfair that people who were permitted to buy land in good faith should suffer, it would not be practical to compensate them for more than the amount of money they had invested in improving the land. If the State bought the land, the value of which in the United States amounts close to two hundred billion dollars, the burden on labor and capital would be greater than it was before until it had all been paid for. In other words, the injustice to the many would be perpetuated.

To conclude, then: Gide admitted that the private appropriation of land-rent was unjust. However, because it is impractical to compensate the few for the injustice to them, the injustice to the many must be perpetuated and labor and capital continue to suffer. This is rather weird reasoning, to say the least. If the people in this country had been guilty of such reasoning in connection with the slavery question, negroes today would be held as slaves on the Southern plantations. Once they were enlightened, they did not believe in temporizing with injustice.

I have shown that Gide could not avoid definite convictions on disputed questions in the science of political economy, and I believe I have succeeded in proving that they were not the logical conclusions of his analyses. This is not to say that his analyses were entirely correct. What

I mean is that, like a motorist, he came to certain cross-roads and, falling into confusion at these points, chose the wrong direction. This caused him to lose faith in the power of natural laws to produce economic and social equality. It is to be hoped that some of his pupils at least, inspired by the very interest and curiosity he unquestionably aroused, have avoided the wrong road and pressed onward in a determined effort to seek the truth.

RAYMOND V. McNALLY.

Rent and Price

CONCLUDING ARGUMENTS ON THE SUBJECT BY L. D. BECKWITH AND OSCAR H. GEIGER

WHATEVER contributes to a clear comprehension of economic principles contributes to harmony in our ranks.

It was to clear away a misunderstanding regarding Emil Jorgensen's book, "The Road to Better Business and Plentiful Employment," that I contributed to the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. My purpose was to show how the conflicting opinions regarding that book are reconciled once certain economic principles are comprehended.

In that article, which will be found on page 116, I argued that while it is true that such rent as may represent one's own obligation to Society—that is, one's "tax"—cannot be passed on, and so can never be a part of price, still it is also true that some rent can be passed on and is a part of price. In other words, both parties to the controversy can be right.

The weakness of the reply made by Oscar H. Geiger (page 119) is two-fold. First, he begins with a conclusion and seeks to justify his position by arguing back to the premises. Secondly, he confines himself almost wholly, if not exclusively, to a consideration of rent paid on the bounty of Nature, which is not an item of cost and can never be a part of rent, and ignores correspondingly that rent which is paid on the bounty of Society and is an item of cost and may be a part of price.

It is the failure to keep these two kinds of rent in mind that has made this controversy possible. We are all in agreement regarding rent paid on the bounty of Nature. The trouble arises because some of us overlook the fact that only part of the rent is paid on the bounty of Nature and that the rest of the rent is very different in certain vital respects.

In my article I argued that, in the case of a merchant, some of the rent should be paid by the customers and is passed on to them in price. Mr. Geiger argued in his reply that rent is a joint creation of the members of Society who, by their presence and by activities inseparable from their membership in the community, make sites in that locality valuable, and that every member of the community has by that presence and those activities paid in full and in

ance for all service rendered him at the expense of the fund; so there is nothing more for him to pay.

Mr. Geiger could show that the entire value of the site is due to the presence of the population and to actions which are inseparable from their membership in the community, and not to any special relationships distinct from and additional to those unavoidable relationships of citizenship (or residence), then he would be correct. But he cannot do that.

Regarding the establishment of homes, the maintenance of those homes and the raising of families are instinctive. Responding to this instinct a member of Society contributes unavoidably to the community rent fund, even though he may have no interest in that fund and knowing of its existence and be unaware of his contribution; for he does what he does as an individual, without partnership arrangement expressed or implied.

Neither the State nor the neighbors participate in the establishment of homes, nor in their maintenance. But something very different from this is necessary, if we have stores, banks, newspaper offices, hospitals, churches, for all these depend upon a partnership arrangement between those who establish these institutions and those who patronize them.

The public gets the land value and the rent resulting from the establishment of homes without having to contribute directly to their support; but not so in the case of the rent on these other institutions. This obligation on the public to support these institutions is not, of course, a legal obligation; but it is something even more binding than that, for it is a decree of Nature herself. Her decree is very blunt and quite pitiless. It is, too, as curt as brusque and merely: No patronage, no store!

And this support must be rendered consciously, deliberately and additionally to that which Mr. Geiger described, as a service separate and distinct from it. Our financial, scientific and professional institutions are partnership arrangements between those setting them up and those patronizing them. And the patrons are held to the strict fulfillment of their obligation by the natural laws of economics. Mr. Geiger is correct in saying that each member of the community makes an unavoidable contribution to the community rent fund, and thus pays in advance and in full for service; but this service is the service financed by the rent that is unavoidably engendered. It does not include the service of stores, banks, professional offices, which is a service special, separate and distinct from and additional to the service unavoidably involved in residence and citizenship.

The conduct of stores is not an act unavoidably connected with residence in a community. Nor is the patronage of any given store, if indeed any patronage is unavoidable. It is additional, special, contractual and optional.

One may fulfill all the conditions of unavoidable relationships of residence and citizenship of which Mr. Geiger speaks and yet find ourselves on Nature's C. O. D. list

and compelled to pay more rent, cash on delivery of the service if we would enjoy the advantage of these stores and other institutions of that character. Our unavoidable participation in the life of the community does not pay that bill.

The question here is not whether the patrons should pay all of the merchant's rent, but whether they should pay their own partnership proportion of the rent expense of the service they receive.

It is understood and agreed that the merchant cannot evade his part. The question is whether the non-landowning patrons can evade theirs.

I hold that, in a free market, neither party can evade his proper share of that rent; that the merchant could not pass his portion on to his customers in price, and that the customers could not avoid paying their portion in the price of their purchases.

Nor do I see why any Georgist should hesitate to admit that this is so. Suppose a community without sewers or garbage disposal service, in which residents were put to personal inconvenience and expense to provide this necessary service. What that service cost them would, of course, be an expense. Suppose now that the community installs sewers and an effective garbage disposal system. Immediately the place is more desirable as a place of residence and land value and rent rise. Residents are saved the inconvenience and expense of providing their own sewer and garbage service, and pay for that advantage in increased rent. By what logic can it be maintained that the expenditures that formerly appeared on the books as sewer and garbage outlay but which now appear there as rent have ceased to be an expense and a part of the price of living? How can this item be in any way an exception to the usual rules governing costs of operation?

To sum up: The controversy over Jorgensen's book results from a lack of clearness in economical vision. It will subside as we see more clearly. Some rent is paid on the bounty of Nature; it is not an expense and cannot be a part of price. Some rent is paid on the bounty of Society; this is always an expense and may be a part of price. In a free market no one can pass to another his own obligation to Society, nor evade payment of his own obligation when it is passed to him. A storekeeper must pay his part of the store rent, and so must his patrons pay their part; for the conduct of a store is not one of those instinctive acts inseparable from membership in a community, but is a special act distinct from and additional to the unavoidable relationships of membership in the community.

L. D. BECKWITH.

* * *

REPLY

In the foregoing contribution Mr. Beckwith says: "While it is true that such rent as may represent one's own obligation to Society—that is, one's tax—cannot be passed on and so can never be a part of price, still it is

also true that some rent can be passed on and is a part of price. In other words, both parties to the controversy can be right."

If confusion can become more confounded, such statements surely will make it so.

Beckwith assumes a "rent paid on the bounty of Nature which is not an item of cost and never can be a part of price,"—by the "bounty of Nature" I assume Beckwith means natural productivity—and a "rent which is paid on the bounty of Society and is an item of cost and may be part of price." How he arrives at this differentiation of rent and still be talking of Economic Rent—the rent of land—is beyond me to understand. Here we have an entirely new thesis in economics, and as Beckwith does not divulge the secret, we shall have to wait until some future time when—if LAND AND FREEDOM's editor permits—he will show us how the two can be differentiated and assessed.

The rent of land in the City of New York is approximately \$675,000,000 a year (including what the government collects in taxes and what the land owners retain as evidenced by the assessed valuation of their land). There probably would be no difference of opinion among economists that the entire \$675,000,000 of New York City rent falls into the category that Beckwith calls "the bounty of Society," and as he holds that such rent "is an item of cost and may be part of price," then the only logical deduction we can make of his thesis is that the Economic Rent of New York City can be and is expressed in the prices of commodities produced or sold in New York. And what is true of New York would be equally true of any and all lands that depend for their value on the presence and activities of the community.

Beckwith has lightened the burden of an answer to his argument in saying that "If Mr. Geiger could show that the entire value of the store site is due to the presence of the population and to their activities which are inseparable from their membership in the community and not to any special relations distinct from and additional to those unavoidable relationships of citizenship (or residence), then he would be correct."

He then speaks of "mating, the establishment of homes, the maintenance of those homes and the raising of families" as instinctive, and evidently advances these "instinctive" activities as the "special relations distinct from and additional to those unavoidable relationships of citizenship" which give value to the store site.

As already pointed out, the distinction Beckwith is trying to draw here is indefinite and presents a phase of value-establishing characteristics in human nature that are entirely new and novel in the science of political economy. Also Beckwith shirks the burden of establishing either quantitatively or qualitatively the differentiation of that rent which is due to Society in its capacity of citizenry and that which is due to individuals expressing their natural impulses and desires.

However, as he places on me the burden of showing

that "the entire value of the store site is due to the presence of the population and to their activities which are inseparable from their membership in the community," I will start by saying that population is an aggregation of human beings, that human beings are creatures of Nature—God's handiwork—and that at no point can they be separated from their qualities, their characteristics, their impulses, their wants, their needs, their desires, from their efforts to satisfy and gratify these human attributes—all of these are Man. Population is distinct from the individual only in that it is an aggregation of individuals; and the only reason that individuals constitute themselves into social organisms and form populations is that they thus can better express their natural urges and more easily satisfy their needs and desires. "Mating, the establishment of homes, the maintenance of those homes and the raising of families" are gratifications of desire no different in essence from the individual acquirement of food, clothing, shelter, education, comfort and luxuries, the companionship of other individuals and the security of person and property, all of which are more easily obtained inside of communities than outside of them, and all of which add value to the site of the store. Economic "mating," which Beckwith places at the head of "special relationships," is made easier in communities than out of them.

Not only, therefore, does the presence of the population and its activities make the entire value of the store site, but they make this value before there is a store on the site. The store comes to the site *because the value is already there*. The storekeeper and all his wares add nothing to its value; they merely avail themselves of the advantages that value already there represents.

Which brings me to what really troubles Beckwith and all other proponents of the belief or hypothesis that Economic Rent is in any way or manner transferable to the products. It finds its way, in whole or in part, into the prices of commodities. What troubles them is that the price of the commodity bears within itself all the costs of production, and that still their opponents (and these include all political economists, fundamental or otherwise) claim that "rent does not enter into price."

First let me repeat what I have already explained in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM: that what is meant by this statement in economics is that, whatever the rent, whether high or low, it cannot and it does not affect the prices of the commodities made or sold on those high- or low-rent sites; that the greater rent cannot be expressed in higher prices, and that lower rent cannot be expressed in lower prices. That is what the statement means and claims, and it means and claims nothing else. A reading of any of the good standard works on economics or of now unfortunately outmoded classical economists will make this point clear.

Rent (Economic Rent) is a differential expressing

greater ease with which the desires can be satisfied, or the greater return that a given effort will obtain. It has nothing to do with price (excepting only the price that governmentally uncollected rent makes it possible for the land owner to ask for his land), and indicates only the advantages of one site over another—not advantages that can be created, but advantages that already exist.

Rent is higher because the product is greater, and this is not because of the greater efforts of the producer, but greater because of the site, the location—population. Price is high or low only in response to the supply of and the demand for the commodity. It is governed by the law of supply and demand only; and the rent of the land on which it is made or sold has no more to do with it than the wealth or poverty or any other personal quality of the purchaser or seller.

A somewhat analogous relationship may be found in high tariffs and high or low wages. The tariff is theoretically supposed to find its way into the wages of the worker, but unfortunately the wages of labor are determined by the number of men out of employment and the price at which the employer can hire labor and not on the greater profits that the tariff puts into the employer's pocket. Thus tariffs may be high yet wages low—as rent may be high yet prices low, or rent low yet prices high.

To attempt to establish a relationship between rent and price is about the same as trying to ascribe lifting supporting qualities to the color blue because a man wears blue suspenders.

And now just a word as to price being the all-including measure that expresses the return to all the factors in production, namely, the return to land, labor and capital in rent, wages and interest; and yet the existence of the phenomenon that rent does not enter into price!

Production on no-rent land which obtains the same price for the product as does production on high-rent land involves one of two concomitants—either smaller production (or sales) or greater expenditure of labor and capital. Production on high-rent land which also obtains the same price as production on low-rent (or no-rent) land also involves two concomitants, either greater production (or sales) or lower expenditure of labor and capital.

What is paid in rent (land rent) is saved in effort. What is saved in rent is expended in effort; thus, although prices include the return to land as well as to labor and to capital, rent yet does not enter into price.

To illustrate more graphically: On no-rent land a market-fixed price of 100 may be arrived at by an expenditure of, say, wages 75, interest 25, while on low-rent land it might be arrived at by an expenditure of, say, labor 50, interest 20, rent 15, and on high-rent land by an expenditure of wages 50, interest 15, rent 35. In these cases the price is the same and the rent is compensated for by a raising of both wages and interest. Thus the differential, rent, does not appear in the price.

Land values in the United States, according to Eugene

W. Way in his valuable treatise, "Taxation and Starvation," rose from \$160,000,000,000 in 1920 to about \$181,000,000,000 in 1930, a rise of over \$20,000,000,000; and yet, according to data compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average price of the 784 commodities used in their computation fell during the same period with a consistent and very slight interrupted drop from about 155 in 1920 to 85 in 1930, taking the average price of 1926 as 100. Thus while land values rose 12½ per cent, the average price of all commodities dropped over 45 per cent.

Land values in 1865, at the end of the Civil War, were about \$10,000,000,000; in 1896 they were about \$38,000,000,000, a rise of 280 per cent. In that same period there was a steady and persistent decline of prices, with almost no interruption whatever, from 132 in 1865 to 48 in 1896, a drop of over 63 per cent.

Land values are predicated on the rent of land. It seems that economic history doesn't support the "rent-into-pricers" or the "high-rent-high-pricers."

But we must be fair. Prices rose from 48 in 1896 to 155 in 1920, a rise of 107 points, or 223 per cent, and during this period land values rose from about \$38,000,000,000 in 1896 to \$160,000,000,000 in 1920, a rise of \$122,000,000,000, or 321 per cent.

Thus, since the Civil War we have had one continued rise in land values and commodity prices and two continued declines in commodity prices with continued increases in land values. All of which proves, if it proves anything, that land values, or rent, have nothing to do with commodity prices.

OSCAR H. GEIGER.

Civilization?

The third degree.

The sweat box.

The whipping post.

Overcrowded prisons.

Prison riots and fires.

Excessive penalties.

Capital punishment.

Idle land.

Idle labor.

Idle capital.

Poverty.

Ignorance.

Too many laws.

Too little justice.

So this is civilization, or is it?

—JOHN J. EGAN in *N. Y. World-Telegram*.

WHEN we put our tariff up, thirty other countries followed suit, and world trade was cut in half. Economic war is sometimes more destructive than actual war, though it isn't so spectacular and doesn't kill so many people. It is going on all the time, and we're now in a state of actual war.—REAR-ADMIRAL SIMS.

The Coming Congress

SENATOR MCKELLAR, OF TENNESSEE, TO ADDRESS THE
MEMPHIS HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS

THE Seventh Annual Henry George Congress at Memphis will have as its guest of honor and speaker Tennessee's distinguished senior Senator, Hon. Kenneth D. McKellar, definite assurance having been obtained by Judge A. B. Pittman, chairman of the Convention Committee, who is busily at work as we go to press completing arrangements for the first national Single Tax convention ever held in the South. All indications point to a highly interesting conference, with all sections of the country represented by active Single Tax workers.

Senator McKellar is a native of Alabama, but has long been prominent in public affairs in his adopted State of Tennessee. He served in the lower House of Congress for several terms and was elected to the United States Senate in 1916, now being in the midst of his third term as Senator. He is a member of the Appropriations and Rules Committees of the Senate and has been a prominent figure in that body since the second Wilson administration. Senator McKellar writes to Judge Pitman: "I will be glad to address the convention and suggest the subject of 'Reduction of Federal Taxation.'"

The convention will open on Monday morning, Oct. 10, with an address of welcome by Mayor Watkins Overton, of Memphis, to which a response will be made by George E. Evans, of Pittsburgh, President of the Henry George Foundation. The programme is now almost complete, though a few invited speakers of prominence are yet to be heard from, and others have not yet been assigned specific topics for discussion. Among the principal orators at Memphis will be the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of the People's Church of Cincinnati; Hon. Peter Witt, former City Councilman of Cleveland; L. D. Beckwith, editor of *The Forum*, of Stockton, Calif.; Attorney Benjamin W. Burger, of New York City; Hon. J. Edward Jones, recent candidate in the Republican primaries for Governor of Illinois, and Hon. William N. McNair, recent Democratic nominee for United States Senator from Pennsylvania.

Emil O. Jorgensen of Chicago, secretary of the Manufacturers and Merchants' Federal Tax League, will have a very timely address on "Why Unemployment?" Chester C. Platt, publisher of the *Batavia* (N. Y.) *Times*, who has just returned from a European tour, will discuss "The Relation of the Single Tax to other Reform Movements." George C. Olcott, of Chicago, prominent real estate appraiser, will discuss "Methods of Determining Land Values Under the Single Tax." Henry Ware Allen, veteran Single Tax leader of Wichita, Kan., will speak on "Social Injustice." Ernest B. Gaston, secretary of the Fairhope Single Tax Corporation and editor of *The Courier*, will tell of the success of America's leading Single Tax

enclave, and Fiske Warren, of Harvard, Mass., will discuss the enclavial movement from a world-wide viewpoint. Mr. Warren is now traveling in Europe and is timing his return so as to be in the United States for the Memphis convention.

Benjamin W. Burger is preparing another comprehensive and important address dealing with the subject of "Single Tax Movement in Perspective." This will be a continuation and an elaboration of the very able and interesting speech at Baltimore last year, and this address is expected to provoke considerable discussion. Dr. M. Millikin, City Councilman of Hamilton, O., and President of the Ohio State League, will present the novel topic "The Adoption of the Price Index as an Aid to the Single Tax." Dr. Walter Verity, of Chicago, is preparing an address dealing with the money question, a topic of special interest at the present time. R. E. Logsdon, director of the Memphis Convention Bureau and an expert on organization, who has rendered notable service in connection with preparations for the Memphis convention, will speak "Organized Publicity." Assistant City Attorney Abner Waldauer, of Memphis, will tell of the successful launching of the new Single Tax enclave, Wall Hill. Oscar H. George, of New York, director of the newly established Henry George School of Social Science, will have a message of special interest for the convention.

Among other speakers who will have prominent places in the convention programme are: Clayton J. Ewin, of Chicago, the very active president of the Single Tax League of Illinois; Charles H. Ingersoll, vice president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, who has recently made a remarkable record for "mass production" on the lecture platform; Robert C. Macauley, of Philadelphia, editor of *Pennsylvania Commonwealth* (who has been prominent in the programme at every Henry George Congress since the Foundation was launched in 1926 at Philadelphia); Claude L. Watson, of Chicago, now one of the principal lecturers of the Henry George Lecture Association; J. Dana Miller, vice president of the Foundation and editor of *LAND AND FREEDOM*; Malcolm McDowell, of Sewanee, Tenn., retired cotton manufacturer and Single Tax writer; Bolton Smith, prominent Memphis investment banker and vice president of the National Council of Scouts of America; Andrew P. Canning, of Chicago, popular toastmaster of the 1928 Congress, Mrs. Mary Johnson of Fairhope, Ala., superintendent of the School of Organic Education, and Will Atkinson, now of Wilmington, D. C., who is so widely known for his constant and effective work as an individual propagandist since the days of Henry George.

Percy R. Williams, executive secretary, and John Monroe, associate secretary, will present reports of organization activities of the past year, and a number of representatives of newly organized Henry George Clubs in various sections are expected to be present with

reports of the activities and plans of these local organizations. President Evans, of the Foundation, has just recently returned from a visit to Russia and Germany and may touch incidentally upon social, economic and political conditions in these countries.

Secretary A. W. Madsen, of the British Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, has cabled Secretary Williams from London to the effect that he now finds it impossible to make the trip to America this fall and therefore cannot accept the invitation to address the Memphis convention. He is, however, preparing a special message dealing with recent activities and developments in the movement in Great Britain. Mr. Madsen expresses keen regret and hopes to pay us a visit next year. The invitation has been renewed, with the suggestion that next year's convention will probably be held in Chicago during the the World's Fair and is likely to be the largest and most representative Henry George Congress yet held, though Memphis is striving hard to make a unique record this year, with every promise of success.

All convention sessions will be held at the Hotel Peabody, which has admirable facilities and is one of the finest hotels in the South, though offering very moderate rates for delegates. Here the annual banquet, always a red-letter event, will be held on the evening of Oct. 11. Generous provision is being made for broadcasting the principal speeches over the local radio stations, and the Memphis Convention Bureau has placed the services of its staff at the disposal of the Congress. Delegates and visitors will be welcomed with true Southern hospitality. The various features of the local work have been delegated to competent hands, with the following assignments to sub-committees: Programme, P. M. Birmingham; Entertainment, L. D. Bejach; Reception and Registration, Dr. W. D. Gaither; Ladies' Reception and Entertainment, Mrs. Alex. Y. Scott; Attendance Building, Albert G. Riley. A publicity committee is also being formed and the local newspapers are giving good notice of the approaching event.

Many delegates will probably be able to take advantage of the very liberal week-end railroad rates in effect at that time from practically all points in the South and Middle West to Memphis. These excursions permit starting on the preceding Friday and do not require departure from Memphis until Tuesday night, and there is a possibility of a special extension to Wednesday being granted by the Illinois Central and other railroads. Motor parties are also being arranged from Chicago, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Pittsburgh and various other points. Fairhope expects to send a good delegation this year, and New Orleans and other Southern cities will be represented for the first time.

Secretary Williams is arranging to spend some time in Chicago during September, conferring and working with Associate Secretary Monroe, who is directing the lecture work and other field activities, and will also meet Single Taxers there who may be interested in the Memphis

convention and other activities. President Ewing, of the Single Tax League in Chicago, recently spent a day in Pittsburgh in conference with Foundation officers, and on his trip East addressed Single Tax dinner meetings in Philadelphia and Washington, D. C., and made a visit to New York, contacting active workers and calling particular attention to the importance of the approaching Memphis convention.

It is suggested that every town and city within a radius of 800 miles of Memphis should send at least one delegate to the Henry George Congress.

The Pittsburgh headquarters of the Henry George Foundation is now located at 238 Fourth Avenue, and all convention reservations or inquiries should be directed to the Executive Secretary at that address.

Southern Tax Conference

VEXING problems of taxation are disturbing the minds of officials, high and low, as well as the rank and file of the taxpayers, in all parts of the country, and the South is having its full share of difficulties in trying to raise needed public revenues and balancing budgets in these times of depression; while some are beginning to see something of the intimate relation of taxation to basic economic problems.

Having this situation in mind and desiring to reach the general public in an effective manner, a Southern Tax Conference has been called to meet in Memphis Oct. 10, simultaneously with the regular sessions of the Henry George Congress but maintaining a separate identity, with full freedom of expression and action. The newly organized Memphis Single Tax Club and the Convention Bureau of the Chamber of Commerce are cooperating with the Henry George Foundation in calling this conference, and they expect to take advantage of the presence in Memphis of prominent visiting speakers who are qualified to present the Georgist tax programme in its various aspects.

The Southern Tax Conference will be a voluntary association of those interested in taxation matters of all kinds and may be continued after the Henry George Congress. It will be given wide publicity through the South, and the Governors of States, Mayors of cities, and chambers of commerce in all cities will be invited to send delegates; also taxpayers' organizations in the various States and communities.

Hon. A. B. Pittman, Judge of the Circuit Court of Shelby County, will preside over the sessions of the Southern Tax Conference, which will occupy one full day and possibly longer, with discussions of the theory and practice of federal, State, county and municipal taxation, and also taking up questions of the taxation of railroads and other public utilities and special sales taxes which have been introduced in some Southern States. It is expected that the Pittsburgh Plan will receive some special attention as an

outstanding example of the policy of concentrating the principal burden of local taxation on land values.

This special conference programme will be separate and distinct from the activities of the Henry George Foundation. It is intended as an open forum for the expression of opinion on all forms of taxation and their social consequences.

Manhattan Single Tax Club

THE Single Tax conference which was held at the Mahwah River Yacht Club on Saturday, June 28, created an interest in land-value taxation among the local people of Rockland County, N. Y. To satisfy their desire for information, another conference was called for the same place on Saturday afternoon, July 16. A representative number of Single Taxers and their friends attended and a goodly number of local people came to hear about Single Tax. Mr. Charles H. Ingersoll, who had recently returned from a six months' cross-country lecture tour, was guest of the day. The meeting opened at 3:00 p. m., with Mr. Walter Fairchild, President of the Manhattan Single Tax Club and host of the Mahwah River Yacht Club, in the chair. Mr. Ingersoll devoted about one hour to an explanation of the Single Tax, dispersed with interesting reminiscences of his trip. Mr. Oscar H. Geiger, director of the Henry George School of Social Science, also devoted a half hour to an explanation of the Single Tax, and the meeting was then thrown open for discussion. Several questions were asked by the guests, which were ably and intelligently answered by Mr. Geiger. Mr. Joseph Dana Miller gave a short address, and Mr. H. C. Maguire submitted figures of the Township of Ramapo in Rockland County, which were very appropriate to the occasion. After the meeting was adjourned the courtesies of the grounds of the Mahwah River Yacht Club were at the disposal of all.

Active work is going forward on the Henry George Educational Board.

At an informal dinner held at Miller's Restaurant, 115 Nassau Street, New York City, on Wednesday, Aug. 24, plans for the formation of an Ingersoll Lecture Committee were discussed. The purpose of this committee will be to sponsor lecture tours by Mr. Ingersoll. The committee will assume responsibility for financing these tours and the publicity activities. The Manhattan Single Tax Club will lend its name, influence and facilities, contributing the services of its office force and the overhead expenses of management and date making. Mr. Ingersoll gave a very fine resume of his cross-country trip. During the six months he delivered 233 talks to 36,270 people, about one-third each to business clubs, social clubs and educational institutions. The publicity aggregates 233 articles in 121 of the best papers in 66 cities and 18 States en route, amounting to over 30,000 agate lines, quoted at \$9,894 by the publishers. The aggregate circulation of these

papers is 6,799,032, which multiplies Mr. Ingersoll's audiences by 184. Mr. Ingersoll presented a scrap book containing copies of these 233 clippings.

Mr. Ingersoll is planning to start from Newburgh, N. Y., about Sept. 15, spending approximately one month touring New York State and another two months through Canada and the New England States. We are now busy arranging engagements.

We are planning another informal dinner for Mr. Ingersoll on the evening of Wednesday, Sept. 14, before he leaves for his upstate tour.

Plans for further activities of the Manhattan Single Tax Club are also being discussed. As soon as the summer season is over and members of the Board are again permanently in the city, the club will resume its regular board meetings, and we hope for a very busy fall and winter.

MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB
(Beatrice Cohen Assistant Secretary).

THAT justice is the highest quality in the moral hierarchy I do not say; but that it is the first. That which is above justice must be based on justice, and include justice, and be reached through justice. . . . As the individual must be just before he can be truly generous, so must society be based upon justice before it can be based on benevolence.—HENRY GEORGE.

MANKIND'S behavior during the last two years could be shown to point to a perceptible loss of that admirable quality—sense of humor. . . . Do not accept the dictum that the world's troubles can only be set right by each country redressing its unfavorable balance of trade by drastically curtailing imports and fostering exports, without stopping to inquire who would be buying those universally fostered exports in a world which is universally curtailing imports?—SIR HENRY STRAKOSCH.

FIFTY MILLION Americans can easily be wrong without half trying. They will probably demonstrate this in November. They will get all worked up about the depression and then throw their votes away by casting them for the successful candidate. This candidate will almost certainly be one who has not the faintest idea of the cause of depressions or who, if he knows, will be strongly opposed to removal of the cause.

MR. WILLIAM A. BRADY, theatrical producer, suggests that Congress substitute a government lottery for the proposed tax on theatergoers. Not a bad suggestion since the government already runs a lottery known as land speculation. All that it need do is tax the proceeds instead of industry.

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

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.
A. 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.
JOSEPH FORSHAW, St. Louis, Mo.
Chicago, Ill.:
HENRY HARDINGE.
WILLIAM H. HOLLY.
THOMAS A. MYER.
THOMAS RHODUS.
GEORGE M. STRACHAN.
HENRY L. T. TIDEMAN.
CLAYTON J. EWING.
J. EDWARD JONES

New York City:
MAX BERKOWITZ.
B. W. BURGER.
BOLTON HALL.
GEORGE LLOYD.
MORRIS VAN VEEN.

* * *

SINGLE TAX LEAGUE OF CHICAGO

The summer months have done nothing to slow up the activities of the Chicago League. A speakers' bureau is being organized, the "Prosperity" pamphlet is being mailed to people in all parts of the country, and the regular weekly meetings are increasing in interest and effectiveness.

A galaxy of leading Single Taxers from all parts of the world have spoken from the League platform this summer. Mr. and Mrs. Walter Burley Griffin of Canberra, Australia; Miss Mildred Tideman of Berne, Switzerland; Messrs. Neil Ness and Arnold Weitzman from Moscow, Russia; and Mr. Edward P. E. Troy of San Francisco are among those who would have written their names in the Guest Book if the League had had one!

Mr. Griffin is the father of Town Planning as it is known today, having been the prize winner some years ago in the \$100,000 world-wide contest for the best town plan for Canberra, the capitol of Australia. Mrs. Griffin has

been in close association with him in all his work, and both decry the evils of socialism as it has been applied in Australia and point to the efficacy of the Single Tax as the necessary foundation for democracy as well as for rational town planning.

Miss Mildred Tideman has enjoyed the experience of a three-year residence abroad since she attended the International Conference for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade at Edinburgh in 1929. Her first position abroad was in the American Library at Paris, later taking a temporary position in the American Embassy at Paris, and then entering the American Legation at Berne. Miss Tideman, the eldest daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Selim Tideman of Chicago, is a graduate of Northwestern University and a firm believer in the Henry George philosophy.

Mr. Troy had recently visited Fairhope and made a tour through the South. The Griffins, Miss Tideman and Mr. Troy left Chicago for their respective destinations on Sunday, Aug. 28.

Other recent speakers before the League include William P. Weihofen of the Chicago Motor Club, Chester Cleveland, attorney, formerly in the office of the Chicago Corporation Counsel; Frank Davin, national organization director of the Saracens; Martin Bickham of the Governor Emerson Relief Commission, and Mrs. Howard C. Phillip of Winnetka.

SINGLE TAXERS' BIRTHDAYS

John Z. White, one whom we may well term the dean of the American Single Taxers, celebrated his seventy-eighth birthday on Monday, Aug. 8, in company with Mrs. White and a few friends. Mr. White is enjoying good health and it soon became evident to all who spent the evening with him that he has lost none of the chuckling wit nor profound wisdom for which he is famous in hundreds of cities. Although he has found time to write a book, Mr. White has devoted most of his time to the care of Mrs. White since she was almost fatally burned two years ago.

Among those who shared the birthday cake with the Whites were Mrs. Frederick H. Monroe, widow of Mr. White's lifelong associate; Mr. Andrew P. Canning, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Tideman, Mr. George Strachan, Miss Dora Green and Mr. and Mrs. John Lawrence Monroe. It was recalled that during Mr. White's twenty-three years' lecturing for the Henry George Lecture Association he addressed some 10,000 organizations and over a million persons. Mr. White's new residence is 3336 Lawrence Avenue, Chicago.

But Mr. White is just a youngster in comparison to George A. Schilling, who reached the exalted age of eighty-two on Aug. 24. Mr. Schilling's spry manner and regular attendance at business and at the Single Tax luncheon table in Chicago would hardly tell his years. Few have rendered a more devoted service to the cause of truth and justice. His report as Commissioner of Labor Statistics under Gov. John P. Altgeld attracted nation-wide atten-

tion and came as near to being a "best seller" as a publication of its character could. Under Mayor Edward F. Dunne he served as a member of the Board of Local Improvements, and under Mayor Carter H. Harrison as president of this board (1911-1915). With such other liberals as Clarence Darrow and Victor S. Yarros, Mr. Schilling organized the Sunset Club in the '90s. The declaration of principles of this club are unique, reading in part:

No President. No Bored. No Steward. No Encores.
No Long Speeches. No Dress Coats. No Late Hours. No Perfumed Notes.

No Preaching. No Dictation. No Dues. No Litigation.

Other prominent Georgists who celebrated birthdays during the last month or two are Fiske Warren, seventy, July 3; Peter Witt, Cleveland, sixty-three, July 24 (his hair is as black as ever); Dow Dunning, Boise, Idaho, seventy-four, Aug. 10, and Frank W. Lynch, San Francisco, seventy-one, Aug. 18.

SINGLE TAX SPEAKERS

Claude L. Watson, Chicago, Ill.—On Tuesday evening, July 26, Mr. Watson addressed a special meeting of the Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs of Coshocton, Ohio. Mr. Fred S. Wallace, publisher of the *Coshocton Daily Tribune* and one of the most persistent and militant of Single Taxers, arranged the appointment. He writes: "Our joint meeting was a good one. The attendance was good, between 120 and 150, I was told. It closed with general discussion, questions and answers, and many remained at the close to talk further with Mr. Watson."

Mr. O. A. Toepfert, leader in the Henry George Club of Cincinnati, is arranging a week's engagement in Cincinnati and vicinity for Oct. 2-8. Dr. Thomas Sullivan of Covington, Ky., is cooperating in arranging appointments in Cincinnati's neighboring city.

Mrs. Howard J. Bailey of Omaha, Neb., already has Mr. Watson scheduled to speak before the League of Women Voters on April 17. "After hearing Mr. Watson this spring," writes Mrs. Bailey, "I am very anxious for more women to hear him explain the Single Tax."

George M. Strachan, Chicago, Ill.—Speaking as an electrical engineer and head of the bridge department of the City of Chicago, Mr. Strachan addressed the forum of the St. James M. E. Church of Chicago on Sunday evening, Aug. 28, on "A Bridge from Adversity to Prosperity." The engagement was arranged by Mr. Clayton J. Ewing, president of the forum as well as of the Single Tax League. The "bridge" to which Mr. Strachan devoted his "sermon" was nothing short of the full Single Tax. "Other measures don't span the distance," maintains Mr. Strachan.

J. Edward Jones, Chicago, Ill.—Mr. Jones spoke before some fifty members of the Crawford Business Men's Association, a community club in Chicago, on Friday, Aug. 26. The appointment was secured by the Single Tax League.

Goods Shut Out and—In!

"**E**VERY pennyworth of foreign goods that comes into this country is paid for by a similar amount of English goods that go out of the country," said Joseph Chamberlain, in 1895. This was true at that time and remains true today. Therefore, for every pennyworth of foreign goods shut out by quota, tariff or other protectionist device, a similar amount of English goods are shut in and unemployment in both countries follows as certainly as night succeeds to day.—*London Commonweal*.

Taxation of Land Values

BY THEODORE H. LUNDMARK,* BEREA COLLEGE, WINNIPEG
FIRST PRIZE (\$100) IN ANNIE C. GEORGE ESSAY CONTEST, SPONSORED BY ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION.

WE are proud of America. Here the laborer is more happily conditioned in all material things than people in any other land. We have built cities, bridges, rivers, tunneled mountains, built almost perfect highways, converted the wilderness into spreading fields of grain and built magnificent temples and skyscrapers. We possess half the world's gold supply, and no people in any other land have accumulated as much of material wealth.

Yet the whole United States stands disgraced, where everywhere there is penury in the midst of more than plenty for all; where laws of privilege and special favor have made droves of millionaires and multimillionaires at one end of the social scale, and millions of unemployed and destitute at the other end. The Kentucky farmer today faces financial ruin. With debts and taxes created on an inflated basis, he is now called on to pay them with his products selling on a deflated basis. With prices much lower than before the war, his taxes are from two and half to five times higher. With what he has to sell bringing half or less than half of what it did before the war, what he has to buy is, in most instances, costing him twice as much. Today taxes take one-sixth of his gross; so, to say more. One out of every six days' work goes for taxes, one out of every six hogs sold, one out of every six gallons of milk, sixteen out of every 100 pounds of tobacco. What is true of the farmer of Kentucky is true of most farmers elsewhere.

What is the cause of the unequal development of our civilization? How can democratic equality and universal prosperity be restored?

The ownership of land is the basic fact which finally fixes the social, political, intellectual and moral status of any people. Mr. M has the right to command land upon which Mr. A. and Mr. C must work so that he can extract the fruits of their weary toil as the price of his permission to work. The State allows land of superior productivity

*[BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE.—Theodore Lundmark was born Oct. 1906, at Brainerd, Minn.; lost his father when he was three. In 1919 Lundmark moved, with his mother, to Detroit, Mich., where she died leaving him to fight single-handed. He dropped out of high school and worked for eight months as office boy in the editorial reception room of the *Detroit News*. He studied typing two evenings a week at the High School of Commerce in Detroit and won seventeen typing awards. His chief interest in life has been music. He attended Iberia Junior College, Iberia, Mo. Graduating from the Junior College, he was recommended for admission to Berea College by friends, and he expected to major in music and give a graduation recital next year. To help defray college expenses he does stenographic work in the Berea College broom factory office. Mr. Lundmark received the decision as first prize winner among sixty-one essays submitted from Berea.—EDITOR]

to lie idle at little expense to Mr. M, and thus natural opportunities are withheld from labor and capital, unless they work less productive land. It is no wonder that the consumer must pay such enormous prices for food products and clothing produced under such unfair conditions.

Furthermore, when the State penalizes the farmer for covering barren fields with ripening grain, fines the man who drains a swamp, and taxes efficiency and thrift on every hand for adding to the aggregate wealth, it violates the fundamental law of nature—that her enjoyment by man shall be consequent upon his exertion. That land is necessary to the exertion of labor in the production of wealth is a simple truth which leading American economists are beginning to recognize.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century Henry George was confronted with a problem not unlike that which is puzzling scholars today. He was struck with the strange paradox that, in spite of the tremendous growth in production and wealth which had resulted from the advancement of civilization, poverty continued. He was also impressed with the rapid increase in land values and the consequent speculation prevalent at that time. As a result of his earnest investigation in the field of economics he was convinced that in these rising land values lay the interpretation of the paradox. Land rents were absorbing the increase in production, and labor was not getting the benefit of it. From this reasoning he worked out a proposed remedy in the Single Tax.

The essence of the Single Tax theory may be given in Henry George's own words, taken from his book "The Condition of Labor," written in 1891: "We would simply take for the community the value that attaches to land by the growth of the community; leave sacredly to the individual all that belongs to the individual; and, treating necessary monopolies as functions of the State, abolish all restrictions and prohibitions save those required for public health, safety, morals and convenience."

In any country, the bare land with its contents and the waters that flow through and about it constitute the natural environment of all the inhabitants of that country. It rightfully belongs to their equal claims, and there is no foundation for allowing private ownership. The privilege of *private occupancy* and use of land, however, is indispensable.

Land should be, and practically is, divided for private use in parcels among those who will pay the best price for the use of each parcel. This price is now paid to some persons annually, and it is called rent. By applying the rent of land, irrespective of improvements, to the equal benefit of the entire community, absolute justice would be done to all. As rent is always sufficient to defray the ordinary expenses of the national, State and local governments, those expenses should be met by a tax upon rent alone.

This "single tax," as Henry George calls it, could be set into operation by increasing, gradually, the tax on

land values and, correspondingly, diminishing the taxes levied on improvements of the land.

Obviously, such a tax would involve absolute free trade, since manufactures, imports, successions, documents, houses and stores and other improvements would be exempt from taxation. Nothing made by man would be taxed at all. The State would take only the rental value of the bare land itself, as a natural resource. Thus, only the unearned increment would be touched.

Not all of the economic rent (value of land) would be needed as taxes, and the surplus could be expended for the collective welfare, in such projects as increased educational facilities, more parks and playgrounds, better roads, promotion of the public health, cleaning up of slums.

A tax on the unearned increment of land, being a pure surplus, would burden no one. Moreover, no one could hold land idle for speculative purpose, because as fast as its rental value increased the tax would be raised commensurately. Hence, the Single Tax will end the injustice of taxing a man for improving his lot with a fine home while his neighbor who holds the land for speculation and raises only weeds pays a low tax until the work of the home owners or some public improvement enables him to sell out at a profit.

The amount of tax which the owner must pay will be determined by whatever the land is worth in the market where tenants compete for the privilege of utilizing it. This will put pressure upon him to put the land to a profitable use. In this way the Single Tax will increase production, thereby augmenting the income of the community.

How would the institution of the Single Tax affect the farmer? The destruction of speculative land values would tend to diffuse population where it is too dense, and to concentrate it where it is too sparse. Hence, the farmer would have the conveniences, the amusements, the educational facilities and the social and intellectual opportunities that come with a closer contact of man with man. As long as very much of the country around the farmer remained unsettled, there would be hardly any taxes at all for him to pay, since the value-for-use of the land is conditioned on population. The improved and cultivated farm, of course, would be taxed no more than unused land of equal quality.

Take, then, for the needs and benefits of the whole community, that fund which the growth of the community creates. The sting of want and the fear of want will disappear. The admiration of riches will decay. Oppressive bureaucracy and oppressive captainship of industry will have a check placed upon them. The little village will be transformed into a great city. Reforestation of our lands and thus the control of our rivers will result. The progress of science, the march of invention, the diffusion of knowledge, will bring their benefits to all. Children now growing up in squalor, vice and ignorance will discover their virtues and splendid talents, thereby making human life richer, fuller, happier, nobler. The Single Tax will construct a

world society providing freedom, equal opportunity and a sense of security.

Various objections are urged against the Single Tax, beginning with an expression of doubt concerning its beneficent working, and ending with the charge of confiscation. Granting that exact results are beyond human power of prediction, it may be safely affirmed that if the principles of the reform are correct, the result may be left to take care of itself. Every great movement in behalf of human welfare, like the abolition of the corn laws or the emancipation of the American slave, have been forced to meet the same prophecies of evil, duly proved to be groundless.

The question has been raised, Is it possible to separate the land value of a country from the labor product of individuals? Admitting that it is impossible invariably to discriminate between land value and the labor product of individuals, the necessity of taxing some of the improvements does not imply that all of the improvements should be taxed. The statement has been made that production would be discouraged by taxing values which labor and capital have intimately united with that of land. The taxing of not only these, but all the clearly distinguishable values which labor and capital create, does result in far greater discouragement.

As a matter of fact, there is no difficulty in distinguishing the bare land value from the labor product, even where ground has been occupied from time immemorial, Henry George points out the fact that a hill terraced by the Romans is now a part of the natural advantages of the British Isles, the same as if a glacier had been the cause. Each generation is heir not only to the transportation facilities, soil, forests, minerals and other natural powers, but also to whatever remains of the labor of past generations.

As regards "confiscation," to give that name to the action of society in taking the value which it creates and which belongs to it, although that value has for generations been misappropriated by individuals, is to misuse terms and confuse sacred rights. The Single Tax aims only to stop the present confiscation. It does not ask indemnity for the past, but security for the future. All it proposes is to take every year that value which society in its collective sense creates during that year, leaving untaxed everything produced by the individual.

While recognizing the justice and propriety of governmental control of certain natural monopolies, such as franchises belonging to all of the people, and now generally bestowed without compensation on private corporations, it would not substitute paternalism for individual freedom. The Single Tax aims at equality of opportunity and not of possessions. With fair play and an open field, it would trust results.

This tax does not fear competition, but has no faith in the stability of a society where free competition is denied. It repudiates the game where part of the players use loaded dice. It has more faith in the people than in their rulers

and does not think that any combination, whether it calls itself a trust or a government, can manage private affairs half as well as the people can do it themselves.

In this hour of economic crisis it is our clear duty to look for a scientific reform of the American tax system. The abolition of all taxes but that on land values would dispose of the large army of tax gatherers, making the government simpler, and hence purer and less expensive. The vindication of George's primal truth shall be realized partly by our own rational and courageous efforts.

It is not because it is a promising invention or cunning device that we look for the Single Tax to do things claimed for it in this paper; it is because it involves the basing of the most important of our laws on the principle that we should do to others as we would be done by. In doing this, the Single Tax involves a conforming of the most fundamental adjustments of society to the supreme law of justice.

WHEN we look into the sweet face of that confiding little child whose picture the Community Chest hangs up on lamp posts at Alms Gathering Time, and then think of the thousands of 99-year land leases and the mountains of bonds and interest that this unjust generation has condemned that poor child to pay, we are heartily ashamed of our kind.—*The California Progressive*.

THE Ottawa Conference is simply a conspiracy in the interests of protected manufacturers and land monopolists. They hope to use it to further their own selfish ends. If it increases taxes and restrictions upon the natural flow of trade, it will cause permanent injury to Great Britain and the Dominions. It will accentuate animosities, and further endanger the peace of the world.—*Sydney (Australia) Standard*.

HENRY GEORGE'S idea of taxing idle land attracted but little attention more than a generation ago; but if such a procedure would give idle men more opportunities for work it might be worth considering.

The taxing privilege can easily be used to promote the interests of business men everywhere, while the present procedure seems to be opposite in character.—Editorial in *Liberty*.

GREEK history states that a certain King Bion pledged himself to offer up a holocaust—burnt sacrifice—of a thousand oxen in honor of any man bringing a new thought into the world, and ever since all oxen bellow tremendously when a new thought comes.—*Progress*, Melbourne, Australia.

JAPAN'S idea of how to break down sales resistance and make business good is to shoot the ultimate consumer.—*The New Yorker*.

Henry George School of Social Science

MEETINGS of the School have been held regularly every Friday night throughout July and August and September, at the School's Summer quarters, 2278 Hampden Place, corner of Fordham Road in the Borough of the Bronx, New York City. The meetings were all well attended notwithstanding the fact that no announcements of the meetings were made and no postal notices sent out, as is the case with the Fall and Winter meetings.

A most hopeful and significant sign pointing to the successful outcome of the work of the school is the sustained interest and enthusiasm displayed by the youngsters (College and upper-class High School students) all of whom have been only recently brought into the movement.

An example of this interest and enthusiasm is exemplified in some of the work they are doing: for instance two of the students, William Walter Moore and Robert Clancy, upon the suggestion and under the direction of Mr. Max Berkowitz, Mr. Geigers' able assistant, paid a visit to the office of the Distributing Division of the *City Record* and gathered from the records assessment facts intended to be used both for the purpose of instruction in the School and for the practical purpose of making taxpayers (especially those who properly improve their lands) conscious of the glaring inequalities prevailing in the field of realty improvements in New York City.

Taking Fordham Road, perhaps the most important thoroughfare of the upper Bronx Borough, Moore and Clancy divided the road between them, one taking the north side, the other the south side. Here are extracts from their individual reports. "Bill" Moore: "Our job was to find outstanding or unusual instances of under-improvement of land with relation to land values, and of improvements that greatly exceeded the value of the land on which they stood and which were consequently bearing an unjust relative burden of taxation. Having no previous knowledge of the relative value of improvements to land value, we assumed that a ratio of from 3 to 1 to 5 to 1 in either direction might be considered unusual. We were soon forced to acknowledge our naivete when we observed numerous cases where the existing ratio was from 6 to 1 to 10 to 1. One outstanding case of under-development (and hence unfair tax burden) is in Block 3189 which stretches along Fordham Road from Jerome Avenue to Morris Avenue. The Walton Theatre Corp., Lot No. 1, has land valued at \$640,000 and improvements of only \$60,000, while the adjacent Lot No. 9, belonging to A. Santine, has land valued at \$100,000, and improvements worth \$240,000. It doesn't require any clairvoyant powers to see and understand that A. Santine is being penalized for improving his property and providing a community benefit while The Walton Theatre Corp. is reaping the reward of such im-

provement in the increased value of their land although having erected only a "tax-payer" on their own land.

"If this revelation that some property owners are having their purse strings loosened to compensate for the delinquency of some of their neighbors is not sufficient to dispose those whose pockets are being picked to Land Rent Socialization, then human nature is not what we would like to believe it to be."

"Bill" is a second-year man at Columbia University.

And here is what "Bob" Clancy says:

"Let us imagine a City Clerk whose duty it is to record the values of individual real estate owners in New York City. His duty stops there. Now let us imagine that his duty did not bar him from thinking, nor bore him with the endless figures of the strange assessments that flow mechanically from his pen. If then he looked in the Bronx book in real estate assessments he might find, as I did, in Section 11, Volume 8, Block 3078, that H. P. Clary who owns land assessed at \$6,000 has built improvements worth only \$2,000; that right next to Mr. Clary, Charles Reinecke, who owns land also assessed at \$6,000 has built improvements worth \$39,000. If the clerk thought, as we assumed he could think, could he avoid thinking this strange? His curiosity aroused, he would then find in the same section in Block 3234, Kappa Signia Realty Co. with land worth \$20,000 and improvements \$2,000; W. Hagedorn, Block 3174, land \$175,000, improvements \$25,000; T. Walters, Block 3166, land \$240,000, improvements \$30,000; Lowenthal Bros., Block 3023, land \$70,000, improvements \$20,000; an unknown owner, Block 3234, land \$15,000, improvements \$1,000 and against these under-developments or under-improvements he would find Mometta Realty Co., Block 3233, land \$84,000, improvements \$491,000; Creston Holding Corp., Block 3233, land \$17,000, improvements \$95,000; H. Muller, Block 3059, land \$10,000, improvements \$45,000; Wm. Stone, Block 3113, land \$58,000, improvements \$167,000.

"Still assuming that the clerk was thinking would he not think that somebody is paying for what somebody else is getting, and what would he think when *these* records reached his gaze: Adson R. Corp., Block 3067, land \$16,000, improvements nothing; J. Clarence Davies, Block 3078, land \$15,000, improvements nothing; Oscar M. Riggs, Block 3091, land \$2,400, improvements nothing; Cedar Ave Construction Co., Block 3233, land \$20,000, improvements nothing; W. Samaris, Block 3067, land \$2,500, improvements nothing; Francis H. Sherman, Block 3067, land \$5,000, improvements.—But why go on? By this time the bewildered clerk (for we assumed that he could think) would be wondering what it was all about, and then we could step up to him and explain the Single Tax."

"Bob" is an art student.

Nor does the example of interest and enthusiasm stop with the work of these and other students of the School. To tell about the Henry George School of Social Science and its activities is to tell about its most earnest and indefatigable worker, Mr. Geiger's most able assistant, Max Berkowitz, an instructor in Evander Childs High School who gives continually of his labor and of his substance to make the work of the School a success. Mr. Berkowitz's latest outstanding contribution to the School's work has been a careful research into the figures of the tax records of New York City in all its five boroughs, and an analysis of these figures that should prove of great value to all students of taxation matters, especially to followers of Henry George.

Mr. Berkowitz finds that for the year 1932, New York City is collecting in taxes 240 Million Dollars on taxable land based on a 2.68 per cent tax rate, that the amount of taxable land value in New York is 9 Billion Dollars and that this taxable (assessed) value of land is evidence that at least 480 Million Dollars of land rent is being retained by the land owners.

Thus the annual rent of land in New York City (240 Million taken by government and 480 kept by land owners) is shown to be 720 Million Dollars, while the Budget of New York, admittedly one of the most extravagant in the world, is only 631 Million Dollars.

Any account of the work of the students of the Henry George School of Social Science would be incomplete without a special mention of the most helpful and painstaking work of its efficient Secretary Miss Edith Salkay, a senior student in Evander Childs High School. It may perhaps be not amiss to say that no work is done at the School, whether class or research work, but that Miss Salkay has a part in it and that is better done because of her efforts.

During the Summer, to lend added interest to the work, to vary the monotony of economic study (for even the Georgian philosophy can become monotonous to youngsters in Summer if pursued without variation) and also to broaden the views and deepen the knowledge of the students, Mr. Geiger offered to devote part of each class meetings to talks on various philosophic and scientific subjects, in addition to his talks on Economics and Sociology. What impressed us particularly in this connection was that in their acceptance of this offer of Mr. Geiger, the youngsters insisted that only part of each meeting be devoted to such philosophic and scientific subjects and that part of each meeting be kept always devoted to the Georgian philosophy exclusively. This speaks well for both the youngsters themselves as well as the manner in which the subject is presented to them. This arrangement, of course, applies only to the Summer meetings, as the regular meetings of the School are all devoted to the Science and Philosophy of Henry George.

The School was honored during the Summer by visits from Mr. Spencer Heath of Elkridge, Md. and Mr. Clayton J. Ewing of Chicago, Ill. Both Mr. Heath and Mr. Ewing

delivered most interesting and instructive talks and both expressed themselves as pleased with the work the School is doing.

Classes will be resumed in Pythian Temple early in October and formal notices of the opening meeting will be given by mail about a week in advance.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(As promised in the May-June number of LAND AND FREEDOM a Question and Answer column will be conducted in each issue under this department).

Question: Is there not a better name, or term, than "The Single Tax" to express our ideas and what we are aiming to do? As I understand it, our proposition is to abolish all taxation and to collect in lieu thereof the annual rent of land. Collecting the full rent of land surely is not a tax. Does not the term Single Tax then cause confusion in the minds of those whom we would convert? In my experience it has conveyed the meaning of both a tax on single (unmarried) men, and a tax on one form of wealth (without distinction as to which) in preference to taxes on many or all forms of wealth. Is there not a more expressive term that we could adopt, that will just tell what it is we mean to do and how we mean to do it? H. B.

Answer: This is an old question and yet it is always timely, always in order, and always troublesome. To meet the objections mentioned by H. B. and many others that present themselves perennially, "The Single Tax Party" changed its name at its convention in New York in 1924 to the "The Commonwealth Land Party," and "The Single Tax Review" in that year changed its name to LAND AND FREEDOM.

True the term Single Tax does not convey to the uninitiate "what it is we mean to do and how we mean to do it," and yet many of our public speakers have had the experience after a talk explaining our principles and our methods, and avoiding purposefully the mention of the term Single Tax, to have some one in the audience ask: "Isn't that the Single Tax proposed by Henry George?"

It is perhaps generally known that the term was first used by the Physiocrats in France during the latter part of the eighteenth century; their "L'Impot Unique," and it was used by several writers prior to Henry George. The term is probably so fastened on to our movement by this time that it will be difficult—(if, indeed, possible) for us to completely rid ourselves of it—assuming, of course, that it is absolutely necessary to do so.

The most descriptive term that conveys correctly the thing we want to do that has come to our notice is that used by Prof. George Raymond Geiger in his book, "The Philosophy of Henry George." He speaks of it as Land Rent Socialization. Among ourselves who know that land rent is just "rent" the term would become Rent Socialization and its advocates perhaps Rent Socializationists or "Land Renters."

Anyway H. B. has brought up a very interesting question for discussion and perhaps there are others who have suggestions on the subject. We will be glad (space permitting) to give them publicity.

Activities of Schalkenbach Foundation

THE September 3 issue of *Liberty* (circulation 2,500,000), carried a leading editorial entitled "Taxes—and How We Hate Them!" which was a straightforward explanation and advocacy of Henry George's principles. During the evening spent with Mr. Bernarr Macfadden, publisher and owner of *Liberty*, in the latter part of August, our president, Mr. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, discussed the importance of Henry George's philosophy and economics, and left with Mr. Macfadden a bundle of literature. In this way the friendly attitude revealed in a previous editorial of July 9 was furthered, and the editorial "Taxes—and How We Hate Them!" seems to have been a result. Certainly it is one of the most significant forward steps that the cause has taken in many a day.

A letter was sent to more than 800 Single Taxers upon the lists of the Foundation, enclosing a reprint of the *Liberty* editorial, and asking that a letter be written to the editor, praising his stand and encouraging future discussion of the Georgist viewpoint. We have already received a number of copies of letters which have been sent to *Liberty*, and wish to thank all readers of LAND AND FREEDOM who may have had part in the work, for their cooperation in writing so promptly.

Two thousand five hundred new copies of "Progress and Poverty," a fourth printing of the Fiftieth Anniversary Edition, have been received from the printer's hands. The book has an arresting, artistic jacket done in red, yellow and black, designed to attract the attention of the bookstore trade. The Foundation has always had a considerable contact with bookstores throughout the country, but the field is a large one and, with this new and attractive jacket, together with a special placard for display, we expect to place the book in major bookstores throughout the country.

Mr. Albert Pleydell, son of Arthur C. Pleydell, lamented director of our Foundation, brought to this office, some days ago, a memento of bygone days. It was an album kept by Mr. Arthur Pleydell among his treasured possessions, because it contained the photographs of many of his co-workers in the exciting and active years of the Delaware Campaign. Among those whose photographs appear are: Mr. Stephenson, Mr. Frank Stephens, Mr. Metzel, Mr. Samuel Milliken, Mr. Louis Bland, Mr. Ed. Ross, Mr. W. L. Ross, Miss Katherine Musson, Mary Metzel, Mr. and Mrs. Burleigh, Mary Broughton, Henry Spincott, Gustav Holle, Mr. Schoemaker, Mr. Chase, Mr. Saylor, Mr. Dick, Mr. Traubel, Mr. and Mrs. Feinberg, Mr. Roller, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Tadd, Mr. J. C.

Frost, Mr. George Katz, Mr. Dressler, and Mr. Hernig. Perhaps among these names you will find some one you know or knew.

Just to show the worthwhile effect of speaking to friends about the writings of Henry George, we quote the following letter:

"I am delighted to have you send "Progress and Poverty." Thus far my interest has been in the two books somewhat in preparation to "Progress and Poverty," the first one, "Social Problems," the second "The Land Question." Then I began "Progress and Poverty," having borrowed it, but I am so pleased with it, I want to own it.

"My mind has, for years, wished to know Mr. George. One of my very dear friends, Professor Dinkins of Selma, Alabama, has talked to me of this subject." He is an ardent Single Taxer. With sincerest appreciation, I am,

MRS. A. C. MITCHELL, JR.

Mobile, Ala."

As a result of a letter sent out to Single Taxers and others in an appeal to distribute books or pamphlets during the Summer months, we report that 150 copies of the unabridged "Progress and Poverty" were sold, and ninety-seven other titles, together with more than 1,000 pamphlets. Many of our correspondents, in ordering their books have told us of the special work that they are doing in their own communities. Among those who have been especially active this season are Mr. David Gibson, Cleveland, O., who is helping us to introduce the books in the important bookstores of that city, and Mr. C. D. Kountz, newspaper writer, who has sent out a great amount of excellent publicity for the Single Tax, etc., in the Ohio district. A committee composed of the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM, Mr. H. Benedict and Mr. Oscar Geiger, have been appointed by the executive committee of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation to work with Prof. George Raymond Geiger in preparing his book, "The Philosophy of Henry George," for publication by Macmillan Co.

Proof-reading, annotating and some small rearrangements of the foot notes will be undertaken by this committee, and it is hoped that an early announcement may soon be made of the publication of Dr. Geiger's book.

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN, Secretary.

Our French Brothers Busy

COMPLIMENTS of Land Rent Socialization believers in America are well deserved by the French publication, *Correspondence Sociale*. This bi-monthly pamphlet is edited by A. Daude-Bancel, 29 Boulevard Bourdon, Paris. *Correspondence Sociale* is now in its twelfth year. The editor would be glad to exchange copies with other publications. He sanctions reproduction of its contents.

It is a well balanced cultural work, with brief observation on the cause it expounds, the mind, the soul and the body in their relation to human acts, very carefully alternated with analyses of current financial problems in Europe, especially Belgium, and brief expositions of some fundamental aspects of the Land Rent Socialization programme.

Death of Charles J. Ogle

IT is with sorrow that we record the death of Charles J. Ogle, of Baltimore, Md., long active in the work. Mr. Ogle had been ill for about a year, but prior to that time was unremitting in his labors for the cause. He was thoroughly versed in the tax laws of Maryland and their history.

Twenty-five years ago he retired from business, since which time he had devoted himself to the cause and especially to the movement in Maryland, as secretary of the Maryland Tax Reform Association.

Mrs. Ogle, who survives him, is legislative chairman of the Maryland branch of the National Woman's Party. He is also survived by a daughter, Miss Dorothy Ogle, who was graduated this year from Swarthmore College, and two sons, Emerson and Hugh Malcolm Ogle.

At the funeral services, which took place in Catonsville on July 28, there were readings from the works of Henry George and a poem by Ella Wheeler Wilcox, "The Creed to Be." Senator Ogden read the 23d Psalm, and Francis I. Mooney read Robert Ingersoll's tribute to the memory of his deceased brother. Senator Ogden followed with a benediction from the Bible (Numbers VL., 24-26).

At a special meeting of the Maryland Tax Reform Association, on Friday, Aug. 5, 1932, at the Emerson Hotel, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas, Charles Joseph Ogle, first secretary of this association, in which office he served faithfully for more than a quarter of a century, departed this life on Tuesday, July 26, 1932; and

Whereas, by his death this association and the cause of tax reform and human freedom have sustained a great loss: Now therefore

Be it resolved that the Maryland Tax Reform Association, in testimony of its debt of gratitude and affection to its late secretary, and its sympathy with his bereaved family, does hereby pledge itself to continue the work of tax reform with renewed devotion and to endeavor to add to the progress hitherto made which was so largely due to the life work of its late secretary.

The committee on resolutions were Francis I. Mooney, John Salmon, Charles G. Baldwin and Spencer Heath.

* * *

TRIBUTE FROM SAMUEL DANZIGER

The death of Charles J. Ogle was not a loss to the Single Tax movement alone. The State of Maryland has lost one of her best citizens. For twenty-five years he devoted his efforts to securing progressive legislation for the State. To accomplish this he put in his whole time and considerable money. Without him it is doubtful if any of the measures he worked for would have been adopted, for he had the ability to inspire others into doing their best to cooperate with him. So it can truthfully be said that to him belongs the credit for leading the work that has given Maryland a constitutional change allowing classification of property for taxation, a constitutional change establishing home rule in taxation, exemption by the City of Baltimore and surrounding counties of factory machinery and output, legislation enabling the City of Baltimore to do away with unfair discrimination in taxation which favored the vacant land owners in that part of the city known as the "Old Annex," and a constitutional change establishing a State-wide referendum. This is by no means a complete list of his achievements. He never held public office, had but little influence with those who did, yet no Governor of the State, no Senator, Congress-

man or member of the Legislature can begin to show as many achievements in the public interest. He had to endure many disappointing defeats. But no defeat ever prevented him from starting the fight anew. In the loss of such a citizen the state suffers a calamity.

As modest as he was militant, he gave the credit of his achievement to the Maryland Tax Reform Association.

Those who enjoyed the privilege of close association with him appreciated his lovable character and had occasion to know his loyalty as a friend who could be depended upon.

It was his devotion to the Single Tax movement that really caused his death. During the legislative session in 1924 he worked tirelessly day and night endeavoring to secure enactment of several measures. The treachery and cowardice of a few members rendered his efforts futile, although one bill came close to becoming a law. Hard work and heartbreaking disappointment proved too much, and on the day the Legislature adjourned he suffered a paralytic stroke. From this he seemed to have recovered completely after an illness of several months, and, disregarding all warnings, he plunged into the fight again as strenuously as ever. In July of 1931 he collapsed again and never recovered. A medical examination finally showed that the tumor which killed him resulted from the stroke of 1924. Another soldier of the common good has fallen in the fight for unappreciative humanity.

SAMUEL DANZIGER.

Georgist Convention in Argentina

THE Georgists of Argentina have met in a two-day session at their Fourth National Georgist Convention.

The accomplishments of these whole-hearted teachers of economic truth during those two days are only exceeded by their fortitude and loyalty to the cause in the face of suppression of the press and free speech and subsequent censorship of both. This test period lasted for seventeen months, starting with the Argentinian Revolution of September 6, 1930, which put the Provisional Government in power.

And now, with speech and press freed from restraint, these steadfast workers for Land Rent Socialization are coming into the open stronger than ever.

The Argentinian Georgist Confederation, in collaboration with the National Executive Council elected yearly by the National Georgist Convention, is employing every conceivable device to catch the public imagination of every citizen of Argentina. The plan is to concentrate upon direct methods of approach to every individual voter in Argentina, for conversion, for cooperation, and for financial aid.

The following are a few of the Argentinian Georgist moves:

Organization of a political party; manifesto sent to all political parties; petition to the President; aid to the most active group, the Georgist Center of Buenos Aires; giving public talks on the streets and squares; *Tribuna Georgista*, the national organ of the Georgist Confederation of Argentina, the leading cultural publication of progressive Argentine Georgists; and the formation of a Georgist Editorial Division.

Address of Fiske Warren

INTERESTING STORY OF THE ENCLAVIAL MOVEMENT FOR
LAND EMANCIPATION, TOLD AT THE HENRY GEORGE
CONGRESS AT BALTIMORE, 1931

MR. WARREN addressed the congress, saying:

The subject on which I am to speak is the Enclavial Movement for Land Emancipation; but, if you will permit me, I will make a preliminary digression to the Philippine Islands, that country from which I have just come, now seething with patriotic fervor for independence, which the Filipinos deserve and which I think we shall find it prudent to concede. What are they going to do with their independence when they get it? It may surprise you to know that the Filipinos are already talking about giving up the idea of homesteading the public lands and, instead, of letting them out for the economic rent of the bare site. That is precisely the plan of Henry George, and I heard a speaker in their House of Representatives arguing that it would be a protection against communism.

Now for my subject. I assume that you are all followers of Henry George and that what you wish to know from me is what progress is being made in putting his ideas in practice. The enclavial movement for land emancipation began in 1895 with the foundation of the enclave of Fairhope. What is an enclave? It is an area of land where, under the terms of leases, the economic rent is collected, as contrasted with the surrounding region, or exclave, where it is not collected, such economic rent being used for communal purposes. The ownership of the land may be either public, as in Canberra and Labuan, or private, as in the other enclaves. Where it is private the rent is used to pay all the taxes, as in Sant Jordi, or certain of them, as in the West.

What is economic rent? It is the annual value of site irrespective of improvements on it. Imagine a piece of land with a forest on it. Cut off the forest; then the value, if any, remaining is the economic rent. Usually it is trustees who hold the land, and they say to anyone wanting a piece of land: If you will take a lease for 99 years and pay the economic rent, we will pay your taxes. The result, then, is this, if the enclave is perfect—it is Henry George's idea exemplified: the economic rent collected, which means equal opportunity for every man, and no taxes.

Beginning with Fairhope, in 1895, there followed twelve other enclaves, till now there are thirteen enclaves, nine in this country, one in France, one in the Republic of Andorra (the only country in the world which has full free trade and no custom house), one in Australia and one in the Island of Labuan. The total area is 925 square miles, with a rent of \$307,000.

A few words about Trapelo, the latest enclave in Massachusetts. It is in the towns of Weston and Waltham. The trustees are John R. Nichols and Francis G. Goodale, which last has made the memorable observation that he

regards single tax as a true development in conscious evolution and the natural next step. Within the last two years Trapelo has increased from one acre to ninety-five and from a rent of \$40 to \$1,829. It has a good golf club; a good school, which is under the able management of John R. P. French, bids fair to be as famous as Mrs. Johnson's Organic School in Fairhope.

A word about Sant Jordi, in the Republic of Andorra, that captive beauty of the Pyrenees! She is beautiful because she has no custom house. She is captive because France on one side, and Spain on the other, with their high tariffs, stand between her and the sea. There is no parcel post going to her from beyond France and Spain. Even the American Express does not penetrate. Everything not important enough to warrant, or be a part of, a special expedition must be paid for in the high prices of France or Spain.

I tried this year to buy 100 bushels of wheat from the Co-operative Wholesale Society of Great Britain to send to Andorra in bond through France, to enable the enclavians to get it at the price of the open market of the world, thus to take advantage of their theoretical freedom of trade. Now, the Co-operative Wholesale Society is trying to extend the bounds of co-operation to include foreign countries, and it also has a heart of gold. It had not yet entered Andorra, was willing to make some sacrifices on a first shipment, the head man was reading "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty," his assistant had read the whole work already, and when they heard that there was an enclave in Andorra and that I was the treasurer of a co-operative society, their enthusiasm carried them past all my outposts of resistance and they forced the 100 bushels upon me as a gift. Did it ever occur to you, ladies and gentlemen, how much the noble co-operative movement has in common with the ideas of Henry George?

A word in regard to Canberra, our largest enclave, which is, as it were, the District of Columbia of Australia. It is almost a joke how it began its career. Prizes were offered for the best plan, and, as it happened, while the two inferior prizes went, one to a Pole and the other to a Frenchman, the first prize went to our Walter Burley Griffin, of Chicago. One trembles to think what might have happened if the first prize had gone to one of the others. For Mr. Griffin, in addition to his plan for the buildings and the lay-out of the streets, proposed that Canberra's revenue be levied on the principles of Henry George. This has been done, and his lay-out was adopted. How different was the bad fortune of Major L'Enfant, who laid out our District of Columbia! He put the statue on top of the Capitol looking toward what he expected to be the City of Washington. The natural result followed that the land speculators bought on that side, and, conversely, the natural result followed that the prudent-minded bought not from the land speculators but from ordinary owners of land behind the statue, and thus we have the comic situation

today, as a consequence of ignorance of economic laws, of the City of Washington displaying itself on the side of the Capitol opposite to that which Major L'Enfant intended. From such a fate Henry George preserved Canberra.

And now for a fairy tale—and yet a true tale! Can you conceive of an enclave coming into existence by accident? Can you conceive of persons who, perhaps never having heard of Henry George, yet put his ideas in practice? Can you conceive of an enclave, so formed, escaping, for ten years, not only my observation but also the vigilant eyes of this organization, so hungry to see signs of advancement—escaping also the equally vigilant and hungry eyes of our brethren in Great Britain, when nevertheless it is a part of the British empire? Yet so it is. I will tell you this fairy story, which now appears for the first time.

The Island of Labuan, ten miles from the nearest coast of Borneo, when still uninhabited, was ceded to Great Britain by the Sultan of Brunei in 1846, in consideration of "an undertaking to suppress piracy and protect lawful trade." "On the first of January, 1907, it was annexed to the Straits Settlements and declared part of the Settlement of Singapore. On the first of December, 1912, it was constituted a separate Settlement." The Blue Book for 1929 gives a population of 25 white and 6,000 colored. The present colored population is estimated at 7,000, of which 2,000 are Chinese and the rest are Mohammedan Malays. The normal rainfall is 150 inches. The climate shows little variation during the year. The mean temperature in 1930 was 80.5, Fahrenheit.

The revenue of the island in 1930 was, in silver dollars (worth 56 cents U. S. currency), 122,374.14, of which 66,437.50 came from the opium monopoly, 28,765.16 from the tariff on liquor, tobacco and petroleum, 6,136.91 from land, and 21,034.57 miscellaneous; while, for local purposes, taxes and licenses came to 20,436.87 additional. For that part of the island under lease, the rent, 6,136.91, is 4.30 per cent of 142,811.01, the total receipts.

The Blue Book for 1929 gives the total area as 19,098 acres, of which 8,608 were still in the hands of the government. Of the remaining 10,490, 3,400 were cultivating cocoanuts; 2,850, rubber; 2,000, fruit trees; 1,940, rice; 250, sago, and 50, tapioca. There were 1,705 holdings under 10 acres; 154 between 10 and 50; 10 between 50 and 100; 5 between 100 and 1,000, and 1 above 1,000.

The government, in true, clumsy, unthinking Anglo-Saxon style, began by giving out land in fee simple, that time-honored, but not otherwise honored, custom. Then, slightly, but only slightly, less deleteriously, it began giving out land on leases of 999 years. But it came to its senses with a jolt, and since 1919 new land has in no case been given out on either model.

That jolt came from the Island of Singapore. It so happened that what was rural land at the time, and was

thought would remain so, formed, later a part of the city of Singapore, because of the rapid and unexpected expansion of that great port. Land had been given out on fixed rents for 99 years, and naturally the lessees made great profits. This so frightened the government of Labuan that since 1919 no new land has been given out except on leases of 30 years. These leaseholds have flat rents continuing for the 30 years. The rate is determined by the government on its value as unimproved land. This rate runs from a minimum of one silver dollar per acre to a maximum of eighty. To make sure that the government does not err in its appraisal and also to discount any expected increment in value during the 30 years, each leasehold is sold at a single premium, payable in advance, and this premium is determined by auction.

As for 30 years being perhaps too short a period to give a lessee a sufficient feeling of security, Mr. C. P. Smith, the Resident, officially representing Great Britain in the Crown Colony, told me that the Malays were proceeding with their improvement without a thought of fear of what would happen at the end of the term; and, for my part, cannot persuade myself that at the end of the term the government will avail itself of its legal rights to deprive the lessee of any part of the accumulated value. I think on the rent will change. In the meantime a lessee is free to sell his improvements to anyone, and the government gives a new lease to the purchaser for the balance of the term.

Labuan is divided between what is called the town of Victoria, with its deep-sea harbor, and what is called the country. I am expecting information concerning the 30-year leaseholds. In the meantime, I think it is safe to say that the total area is not less than 2,500 acres, of which not more than 200 is in the town. Now, in the country no levy has ever been made on the improvements, or on the equipment of live stock; hence in an area of at least 2,300 acres there is a perfect enclave, except for licenses and except for artificial prices.

Licenses in the country are two silver dollars on a bicycle, one on a gun, fifty cents on a dog, and at varying rates on automobiles, averaging perhaps \$30. Thus if an enclave in the country does not have any of these articles it remains for him a perfect enclave, except for artificial prices.

What about these artificial prices? One has to do with opium, which is a governmental monopoly; and there are only three others: liquor, tobacco and petroleum, which last covers gasoline. Thus, for an enclavian in the country who does not have occasion to pay licenses and does not use opium, liquor, tobacco or petroleum, it is a 4.30 per cent perfect enclave.

Taking both parts together, the town and the country, I rate the enclave in Labuan as 41 per cent perfect; that is to say, 41 per cent of the total governmental levy comes from site. That is higher than the average for the enclaves in the United States.

Let me now recite what contribution I deem the enclavial movement makes to the cause of Henry George.

It is splendid for advertising, for it reaches the ordinary voter. Every man going into an enclave and seeing things to praise comes out and spreads the story.

What good cheer do the enclaves give us about the great depression? They tell us in the case of 12 of the 13 enclaves (from the 13th I have not heard) that there has been no case of money going from taxes to poor relief.

The enclave in Labuan tells us that, since its foundation, although the Chinese money lenders ask 15 per cent, the limit of legal rate of interest, when security is given, there has been no case of failure to repay, although there has been a prodigious drop in the prices of copra and rubber.

The enclave of Saint Jordi tells us that there is neither depression nor unemployment there, in spite of a drought.

Then again the enclaves are valuable to our cause as laboratories where the best forms of operation are being evolved, in practice, to serve as models for legislatures.

Next, is it not an achievement of importance that the total rent of the land under enclavure is now handled in behalf of the people and that the area represented is no longer handled by private landlords, privilege or monopoly?

Finally, if the cause is not marching on as fast as most of us desire, is it not deep satisfaction to be able to prove that it is really marching—to watch the increasing areas, to mark the increasing rent, to know that justice is gaining ground?

Taxes—and How We Hate Them!

MORE than a half century has elapsed since Henry George wrote "Progress and Poverty." Therein he explained this paradoxical situation: the more progress we have the more we suffer from poverty—that is, some of us.

Great riches seem nearly always to bring extreme poverty, and Henry George pointed out a definite remedy.

Until our recent unpleasant experiences we had always been convinced that we were the greatest people in the world; that our customs and laws—everything American, in fact—were the best in the world. In comparing ourselves to the various foreign countries we always had a definite feeling of superiority.

But now we have been shaken from this satisfied complacency; we are definitely willing to admit that something is wrong. And Henry George told us more than fifty years ago that it is our taxing system.

Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, has maintained that the remedy suggested by this outstanding economist would be dependable. Tolstoy, the great Russian author, maintained that this system would ultimately be accepted by the world because it is so logical.

The advocates of the Single Tax maintain that it will discourage and ultimately destroy speculation in land which makes its price high. It will transfer the economic rent in annual land value to the public treasury. It will displace all taxes on labor and capital, all of which are taxes that increase the cost of living.

Taxation is invested with the power of life and death; it is a two-edged sword: if it is right it will conserve prosperity and dispel depres-

sion; but if wrong, it will create unemployment and make living costs unbearable. Our present system of taxing everything, it is maintained by Single Taxers, is oppressing both capital and labor. It is one of the causes of our financial troubles.

Every constructive effort we make adds to community wealth, to its land value; and that land value is our own because it is the product of mutual efforts. It is the result of gathering into communities, and of our cultural association, and of the social services we organize and operate. This wealth is just as tangible and extensive as wealth we create and store in warehouses and bank vaults or build into great city structures.

And here is where the Single Taxers maintain we should secure our funds to support our government—from land values. Exchange several taxes for one tax. They maintain that the advantage of this form of taxation is its simplicity and efficiency. The tax on land is out in the open, easy to inspect and easy to value. Compare this method with the present system with its horde of officials employed in administering taxes such as the tariff, income, tobacco, gasoline, etc., etc.

Taxation of land values will destroy the "industry" of holding land idle for years—sometimes decades—while population grows and makes it valuable.

And it is further maintained that the farmer would not suffer from this form of taxation because improved land would be exempt under this system. The farmer would be taxed only on what he would call the "run-down" value of his land.

The Single Taxers believe that their system will break up the bread lines and frozen deposits in banks, as well as in tin boxes and socks, and put both idle capital and idle labor to work building on vacant lots and in the business enterprises to follow.

Now that we are looking for remedies, even revolutionary ideas that will bring about a more equalized distribution of wealth are worth consideration, and the enthusiastic advocates of this Single Tax system deserve attention.—Editorial in *Liberty*, Sept. 3, 1932.

TRUE free traders have never enthused over Great Britain's spurious free trade, and have few tears to shed over its abandonment. So long as industry must bear taxation it is better that the tax be called by its right name than be misbranded "free trade."

BOOK NOTICE

"THE HOLY EARTH"

Such is the title of a small book by Dr. Liberty H. Bailey of Ithaca, N. Y. A descriptive title might be: "The Right Use of the Earth." It is inspiring, prophetic, optimistic, and democratic. It is refreshing to one who, like myself, has been nauseated by reading real estate board literature and the flaming, mendacious advertisements of the large land speculators, who actually call land a "commodity," as if it is of no greater economic importance than are groceries. "The Holy Earth" treats land respectfully, even reverently.

Dr. Bailey is not a political economist, but his book will be agreeable to readers of LAND AND FREEDOM. The wide sweep of his short essays cannot be shown by a few paragraphs, but the following may be quoted as especially interesting:

"This will necessarily mean a better conception of property and of one's obligation in the use of it. We shall conceive of the earth, which is the common habitation, as inviolable. One does not act rightly towards one's fellows if one does not know how to act rightly toward the earth."

"We begin to foresee the vast religion of a better social order."

"More iniquity follows the improper and greedy division of the resources and privileges of the earth than any other form of sinfulness."

"The naturist knows that the time will come slowly—not yet are

we ready for fulfillment; he knows that we cannot regulate the cosmos, or even the natural history of the people, by enactments. Slowly: by removing handicaps here and there; * * * by teaching, by suggestion; by a public recognition of the problem, even though not one of us sees the end of it."

"It is now easy to understand the sinfulness of vast private estates that shut up expanses of the surface of the earth from the reach and enjoyment of others that are born similarly to the privileges of the planet. * * * There is no inalienable right in the ownership of the surface of the earth. Readjustments must come * * * and in the end there will be no private monopoly of public or natural resources."

"If we may fraternalize territory, so shall we fraternalize commerce. No people may rightly be denied the privilege to trade with all other peoples. * * * It would be a sorry people that purchased no supplies from without. Every people, small or large, has right of access to the sea, for the sea belongs to mankind. It follows that no people has a right to deprive any other people of the shore, if that people desires the contact. We now begin to understand the awful sin of partitioning the earth by force."

His chapter on War and the Struggle for Existence is a unique attack on one of the arguments of militarists.

The author was born on a Michigan farm near the shores of Lake Michigan. Early he developed capacity for study of the physical sciences, and, when he entered the Michigan Agricultural College as a student at the age of 17, he was well grounded in the science of botany. After graduation, he remained as a teacher of horticulture in that institution, until Cornell University called him, and he was connected with its agricultural college for a quarter of a century. Then he retired, built himself a home in Ithaca, where he has a large herbarium, and devotes his time to the study of botany and to literature. He has been a voluminous writer and a busy editor in the field of natural science but he occasionally publishes essays and verses.—H. M. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

A FAMOUS DOCTOR MAKES A DIAGNOSIS

EDITOR LAND FREEDOM:

Your clear and incisive comment in the July-August number, on Norman Thomas's failure to understand the importance of the land question, and his reluctance to admit that a single remedy may set right a complicated social illness, recalls the familiar medical illustrations, which may be put in dozens of ways, but has not lost its point.

One physician fails to "think through." He fastens his attentions on symptoms—anemia, breathlessness, lassitude, mental and bodily feebleness, dizziness, etc., and would give a medicine—perhaps a mixture of drugs—for each. The other does think through. He seeks a common cause for all the complex symptoms, and finding it (say hookworm infestation), uses a medicine (say thymol or carbon tetrachloride to kill and expel the parasite) that will remove it. Then he takes proper precautions to prevent recurrence.

Landlordism is the social hookworm. So long as it is permitted to drain the body politic, and to inject its poison into the stream of the circulation, so long will the consequent ills continue. There is one means, and only one, to bring about social health. Kill and expell the parasite by collecting the rent of land for the public treasury—thus becoming able to abolish unjust taxation.

S. S. C.

Philadelphia, Pa.

WILL PAY NO MORE FOR CAPITAL THAN IT IS WORTH

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

"Capital" appears to be only technically a factor in the production of wealth. It is merely an auxiliary to labor.

"In truth, the primary division of wealth in distribution is dual, not tripartite. Capital is but a form of labor, and its distinction from labor

is in reality but a subdivision, just as the division of labor into skilled and unskilled would be. In our examination we have reached the same point as would have been attained had we simply treated capital as a form of labor, and sought the law which divides the produce between rent and wages; that is to say, between the possessors of the two factors, natural substances and powers, and human exertion—which two factors by their union produce all wealth." ("Progress and Poverty," Bk. III, Ch. V.).

Then to consider it as one of three factors is misleading:

"Yet this, to the utter bewilderment of the reader is what is done in all the standard works * * * they proceed to treat of the distribution of wealth between the rent of land, the wages of labor and the profits of capital." ("Progress and Poverty," Bk. III, Ch. I.).

Capital produces no more than Hope, or News, or Currency, or Food. We might pour quantities of all these, say, into a mine and they would be dead till labor came. All are mere aids to labor: "Capital * * * is in reality employed by labor." ("Progress and Poverty," Bk. III, Ch. I.).

"In truth, the primary division of wealth in distribution is dual, not tripartite." ("Progress and Poverty," as above). Land and Labor produce all wealth.

The returns to "Capital" are then either rent or wages.

It follows then that whatever part of "interest" is due to increased return to Labor will increase, as Henry George wrote. But whatever part is due to Monopoly will disappear entirely.

But in any case we need not worry over interest. Under free conditions no one will pay for capital more than it is worth to him.

N. Y. City.

BOLTON HALL.

CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Two questions have been running through the columns of LAND AND FREEDOM that should be settled among Single Taxers sometime and dropped, leaving the space for something better. They are (1) Whether rent is added to price? and (2) What is the cause of interest and whether interest will persist if or when the Single Tax prevails?

The first is answered by Ricardo's "Law of Rent:" that rent is the excess value of any land over the poorest land in use. This excess value is taken by the land owner. It may be observed by any one from the fact that wheat grown on the poorest land sells on the market for the same price as wheat grown on the best land; or from the fact that one may go from a country village to the business center of Chicago or New York, and buy as cheaply as at the village store.

The second may be answered by saying that if and when the Single Tax prevails, capital will be what it is now, a stored up labor product and if one has capital which he does not want to use presently and another needs it for present use, the latter will pay the then market price for its use, if any, as there probably will be. That is as far as we need to know at present. Let nature take its course. It will anyway. Our present duty is to work for the Single Tax.

JOHN HARRINGTON.

Oshkosk, Wis.

DEFENDS PROHIBITION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I read the letter of Howell Clopton Harris, of Cordele, Ga., in your May-June issue with pleasure, for prohibition made me a teetotaler. I recall that some years ago a fellow-Single Taxer used to dwell on the idea that if we had the Henry George land value tax in effect, liquor would be exempt from taxes and in consequence the stuff would be so cheap that very little would be sold and as a result temperance would be promoted. I believed that theory then, but I don't now. Alcohol beverages are a habit-forming drug and the cheaper the stuff the more would be drunk and the more drunkards made.

I am as much in favor of personal liberty as any Henry George man but I do not take much stock in the personal liberty gag as applied to booze. I believe that the Ten Commandments and all laws, rules and

regulations interfere with personal liberty, but such laws are for the general benefit of the vast majority of people. And prohibition is one of those laws. I know of its general benefit in many cases. Traffic lights are a denial of personal liberty, but don't drive by when the red light is on.

W. L. CROSMAN.

Revere, Mass.

MR. ASHTON IS VIGOROUS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The debate now waging, as to whether rent is the hen or the egg, reminds me of Kant's critique of Pure Reason, and also brings back a flood of memories of my law school days when it was a daily ordeal to conform my mind to the "cramping" (as George styles it) which creates a distinction where no difference in aims exists. It is this interminable search for the absolute that wrecked Protestantism into fifty-seven varieties and which gave Heinze his idea for a pickled fortune.

If I had not fortunately read George's unanswerable argument for moral results before meeting the present contest of wits and words on the theoretical ultimate I would now conclude that Single Taxers were more concerned with an argument than with the regeneration of humanity.

Your debaters of the moment are simply creating the very condition which they profess to avoid, i. e., mental confusion. We have burdens enough without becoming spectacles to those whom we would convert. If such highly educated antagonists as Prof. Seligman of New York and Dean Dowham of Cambridge, are not concerned whether rent is the head or the tail of the dog I am sure that those unfamiliar with Single Tax are less concerned whether rent is the hen or the egg. Who shall have the egg is our only concern. On this point there is no argument and it ill becomes Single Taxers to provide anti-Single Taxers with the defense of confusion in the minds of Single Taxers. If the antis should ever raise the question as to priority of the hen or the egg in economics then, in legal parlance, the burden of proof is upon them.

We have hay to make while Depression's sun is shining, so let's not start an economic education in "cramping" until we are safely passed our industrial cramping and until the economic eggs are safely stowed into the commonwealth's market basket.

Kant undoubtedly enjoyed his journey into the field of Pure Reason. Has any one else enjoyed it? Has Kant alleviated humanity's sufferings? Let's avoid reducing Single Tax to cant.

Fall River, Mass.

THOMAS N. ASHTON.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

ANOTHER extraordinary find is to be credited to Benjamin W. Burger, or rather to one of his legal assistants, in the purchase from a London bookshop of a rare pamphlet. We quote the title page: "Printed for John Palaiet at Dukes Arms, Strand, being Considerations on the Several High Duties which the Nation in General (as well as Trade in Particular) Labors Under, with a Proposal for Preventing the Running of Goods, Discharging the Trader from any Search and raising all Public Supplies by One Single Tax."

And this little work was printed in 1743!

Of course it is not the Single Tax as we understand it. The writer would substitute "one single excise duty over all Great Britain and that upon houses." He would exempt the poorer inhabitants from this duty, and he dwells upon the advantage to the people of "paying one duty instead of many." It is one of the earliest pleas for free trade, for he would wipe away almost every duty upon importations. While indicating that necessity might excuse certain exceptions to the rule he lays down, he says: "That all prohibitions are in general hurtful, however, has ever been my opinion."

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY, of Takoma, Wash., son of the late E. Stillman Doubleday, is Democratic candidate for Secretary of State. He

will emphasize the land question and opportunities for the unemployed. With a combination of Democrats and Progressives his election seems very probable.

THE *Fairhope Courier*, organ of the Single Tax colony at Fairhope, Ala., in its issue of August 4 began the 39th year of its publication.

CHARLES D. BLACKHALL was the maker and originator of a series of "sticker" stamps in the '80s. He is now preparing for distribution a series of leaflets suitable for handouts or for enclosure with regular mail. He will print and distribute at actual pay-out cost, making no charge for his own time. Each item is to contain fifty to one hundred words on a sheet $3\frac{1}{2}$ by $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches. There should be about fifty in first lot printed on large sheets to keep down the cost. Mr. Blackhall wants copies of statement from readers of LAND AND FREEDOM who are asked to get busy and mail copies to C. D. Blackhall, 35 North Division Street, Buffalo, N. Y.

HOWELL CLOPTON HARRIS, of Cordele, Ga., in an excellent letter in the *Macon Telegraph*, analyzes the tariff statements of a speaker before the Rotary Club of that city. Mr. Harris makes good fun out of it.

H. W. NOREN has made a demand that the grave of Jefferson be opened in order to determine whether he has turned over on hearing of the proceedings at the late Democratic convention.

DR. JAMES MALCOLM, of Albany, wrote to the editor of the *Nation* a letter on the Single Tax which that paper refused to print. Mr. Malcolm wrote a second letter to Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard intimating that he had regretfully reached the conclusion that Mr. Villard was hostile to the Single Tax, to which that gentleman replied: "Not hostile, just uninterested and not convinced." Which prompts us to advise Single Taxers to leave Mr. Villard alone. The same applies to Arthur Brisbane, who defends land speculation and the diversion of about thirteen billions of publicly created value goes into private pockets, part of it into Mr. Brisbane's pockets. "Not interested," says Mr. Villard. "Very much interested," says Mr. Brisbane advising his readers to get in and help themselves to it. And the *Nation* is a reform paper—God save the mark!

MAJOR GENERAL PENDLETON is an inmate of the Naval Hospital at San Diego, Calif. General Pendleton is seventy-two years of age and since his retirement eight years ago has served as mayor and councilman of Coronado.

FATHER COX on the morning of June 9 addressed 10,000 of the ex-service men and shouted: "Who owns the land of America—Herbert Hoover, incorporated, or the American people?"

WALDO J. WERNICKE, of Los Angeles, is as usual extraordinarily active in letter writing to newspapers and official bodies.

EMIL KNIPS, of Fairhope, has written to Jackson Ralston congratulating him on the article from his pen in July-August LAND AND FREEDOM. He calls it a clear cut and convincing analysis of the farmer's problem and suggests its publication in leaflet form for wider distribution.

A. G. BEECHER, of Warren, Pa., who needs no introduction to the Single Taxers of the country, is now about after a five months stay in the hospital, and is slowly improving. He has written a hymn for our cause to the tune of "My Country, 'tis of Thee" and also makes a suggestion for a badge or button to be worn by Henry George men.

CHARLES G. BALDWIN, of Baltimore, sailed on the Ile de France on

Aug. 26. He may get over to England to celebrate the Henry George birthday.

A DOUBLE-LEADED editorial appeared in the *Philadelphia Ledger* in August entitled "The Road Back: It Leads to the Land." Unfortunately the editorial itself leads nowhere. But it is nevertheless significant.

THROUGH the work of John C. Rose and others there originates in Pittsburgh, Pa., many thousand letters annually, explaining the Georgean philosophy and dwelling on current events from the Georgean view point. These go to all sorts of publications and a vast number are published. If you wish the daily or weekly paper of your city or town to receive these letters or such as are suitable to it, it is necessary that you send the page where the letters customarily appear, and also the editorial page of the paper. Mail sample pages to John C. Rose, 1112 Forbes Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

THE National Party has placed in the field nominations for President and Vice President, John Zahnd and Florence Garvin, the daughter of the late Governor Garvin, of Rhode Island. John Zahnd states to a reporter of the International News Service that "We advocate the taking of the full rent of land for public purposes as the only logical way to real prosperity." The by-laws of the party reads: "We demand that the full rent of land be collected by the government in place of all direct and indirect taxes." Readers of LAND AND FREEDOM need not be told where Miss Garvin stands. A column interview with her in a Providence paper makes her position clear. She says the National Party, which has its main strongholds in Indiana and Missouri, owes its origin to Congressman Charles A. Lindberg, father of the famous aviator. In 1924 Miss Garvin was candidate for Congress on the La-Follette ticket.

A RECENT visitor to this office was Clayton J. Ewing, of Chicago, who is spending his vacation in visiting cities where Single Taxers reside. On August 18, he was entertained at the Sketch Club on Camac Street in Philadelphia, where he delivered a talk. Present at this gathering were Robert C. Macauley, Harold Sudell, Frank Stephens, Mr. and Mrs. Hoopes and many others. Mr. Ewing talked on the importance of the coming Memphis Henry George Congress and urged the establishment of a Henry George Club in Philadelphia. He was present also at a gathering at Harry Olney's cafeteria in Washington, D. C., and talked on methods of propaganda.

HELEN IRENE ELDER, of 1940 Hearst Avenue, Berkeley, Calif., writes, saying that she read with great appreciation Franklin Wentworth's radio talk. She suggests the use of screen pictures by patriotic youthful organizations like the Boy Scouts for the inculcation of our message. Those interested may communicate with her. She asks, "Why couldn't all the Single Tax associations get together and form a film company?"

WE have received the Principles and Programme of the Progressive League of America, from Los Angeles. It is a sound document. The signers of the declaration are R. E. Chadwick, Harry E. Farrell, Frederick W. Roman, George J. Shaffer, and David Woodhead, all names well and favorably known to the Single Tax world.

THOMAS N. ASHTON, of Fall River, is candidate for re-election to the Massachusetts legislature. He has compiled some valuable taxation data for campaign use which we hope to make available for the columns of LAND AND FREEDOM.

WILLIAM MATTHEWS, of Spokane, Washington, at a meeting of the Public Forum in that city presented a resolution advocating a plan

already in operation in Canada for the seizure of any unused or unoccupied lands and abandoned farms, and turning them over to the unemployed, such land to be exempt from taxation for a period of five years. The resolution was unanimously adopted. In Canada, we are told by *Labor*, of Washington, D. C., that a sum of money is advanced to enable the settler to become established on a self-supporting basis.

C. J. S., under which initials we think we detect Charles J. Schoales, has an excellent letter in the *Philadelphia Record* of July 31 under the striking head, which the *Record* puts in large type, "The Voice of Henry George, What Has He to Teach, if Anything, in This Day of Depression, War Debts, Reparations and Despair?"

A LETTER from Charles G. Merrell in the *Cincinnati Post* called forth an editorial in that paper. Mr. Merrell in his letter uses material from Mr. Jorgensen's pamphlet, "The Road to Better Business."

W. E. ALEXANDER, of Ethridge, Tenn., has an article in the *Labor Advocate* of nearly two columns in length.

E. R. URELL, of Mansfield, Pa., veteran worker in the cause, delivered an address before the Pomona Grange at Mitchells Mills, Pa., under the title, "Just Taxation Will Solve the Unemployment Problem." There were about 150 in attendance and the *Mansfield Advertiser* printed the address in full, covering nearly three columns. It is a wholly admirable talk, some of it couched on a plane of beauty and eloquence. Mt. Urell writes us: "I am eighty-one years old and feeling fine."

IN an address before the Engineer's Club, of Dayton, O., Dr. Mark Millikin reviewed the talk of Kirby Page before the same body, a plea for socialism. The *Dayton Daily News* gave Dr. Millikin's address a good report. Dr. Millikin had concluded his talk as follows: "I am not pessimistic about this thing we conceitedly call civilization. It is pretty tough but it has antidotes for its own intoxications."

The Pitchfork is a nationally known periodical at Dallas, Texas, which has been published for 26 years. In the August issue it comes out for the Single Tax and says: "The first blow at privilege should be to free the earth and for the use and occupancy of every landless man—and this can be done by the simple expedient of applying the Henry George theory of the Single Tax on land values."

"DAD" has contributed during 1932 to various issues of *The Gateway*, a local paper of Floral Park, L. I., a series of papers in blank and rhymed verse entitled "At the Feet of the Philosopher." These consist of paraphrases from "Progress and Poverty." We acknowledge receipt from "Dad" of a small loose leafed scrap book, leather bound, containing these articles complete. A number of these have been prepared as gifts to old friends. Typewritten on the first page is the dedication: "To the memory of Oliver Rule, sincere Christian and Philosopher, in appreciation of the fact that it was through him I was shown this great truth."

READERS of LAND AND FREEDOM will be interested to know that Joseph L. Richards, of Hanover, N. H., contested the United States Senatorship with George H. Moses in the New Hampshire primary. Mr. Richards is a Single Taxer. Our old friend George H. Duncan will run for Governor.

SEVERAL well-written letters have appeared in the Los Angeles and Hollywood newspapers from R. J. Kinsinger.

RICHARD WELTON, of Cheswold, Del., calls himself a benevolent communist. Mr. Welton, who is a musician, has had an interesting career. He read "Progress and Poverty" in 1886 on a journey to a Kansas college. He was expelled from that college on account of his views. He played the organ at Chickering Hall at the first Anti-Poverty meeting. In the same year he made the acquaintance of George, McGlynn, Post and Croasdale. He was a speaker in Delaware during a campaign for the Single Tax in that State. In 1900 he went to Denver and made the opening speech of the campaign with Senator McKelvin on the night of his arrival. He attended the Baltimore conference last year, and has by no means lost a particle of his interest in the cause, having just written a small book the manuscript of which I have been permitted to see. He is seventy-seven years old.

HENRY GEORGE's birthday was celebrated in Los Angeles on September 2 by a gathering of fifty-five workers in the cause. Among the speakers were: Edson Scofield, Charles James, George Shaffer, W. F. Smithers, David Woodhead, Ralph E. Chadwick and A. J. Samis.

THE death of James A. Ford at the age of eighty-nine is reported. Mr. Ford was a Civil War veteran. Mr. Wernicke, of Los Angeles, tells that he was once secretary of the St. Louis Single Tax League. He is one of the early California newspaper men and founded the *Mountain Messenger* at Downieville in 1869.

In an article in the *Christian Science Monitor*, "Can the Single Tax agitation be Revived?" by Willis J. Abbott, is contained a brief review of some of the incidents of the movement in the early days. Though there has never been a moment when the agitation for the Single Tax has been allowed to die out, Mr. Abbott refers, of course, to its prominence in the popular thought of today as compared with the years when Henry George and Tom L. Johnson were alive. Mr. Abbott in his article mentions the recent editorial in *Liberty* and senses a revival of popular interest in the cause.

REPLYING to a letter from Julius Young in the *World-Telegram*, deplored the absence of a "youth movement" in this country, Miss Colette Kaufmann, the efficient secretary of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, states that Henry George in his famous book "Progress and Poverty," sounded a note that if taken up by the youth of this country would lift surprisingly the level of our social and economic life. She states the purpose of the Schalkenbach Foundation is to popularize the teachings of Henry George and reveals a strong response from the young people of our schools and colleges.

THE Henry George Foundation of Great Britain, 94 Petty France, London, S. W. London, England, announces a prize essay contest to close March 27, 1933, two awards of £10 each, six awards of £5 each and twenty-five awards of £2 each. These essays are to be on the "Principles of Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, their necessary relationship, and their practical application as a remedy for unemployment and poverty." Essays are not to exceed 5,000 words in length.

HERBERT ALLEN, of Asheville, N. C., sends us a copy of the *Asheville Times* which contains an editorial in which it comments on conditions. Turning its searchlight on local matters the editor points out that four-fifths of the assessed valuation of property in Buncombe County, amounting to \$143,500,000, is in the hands of five per cent of the tax payers. The *Times* sees no remedy for the conditions it describes. Doubtless the editor would welcome informative literature on the subject.

HON. PETER WITT, of Cleveland, will deliver the keynote speech at the Memphis Henry George Congress, his subject being the vital theme of the hour, "The Depression, its Cause and Cure." This will probably be staged at the opening luncheon on Monday, October 10.

THE United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, London, England, reports the sale of over 1,000 copies of the Henry George's "Science of Political Economy," just published.

AMONG active Single Tax letter writers to the newspapers mention should be made of Walter Munch, of Minneapolis.

THE *Birmingham* (Ala.) *News* of September 4, contains a two column article on Fairhope, by David Holt, entitled "Single Tax Colony Seen as Successful." The article is altogether favorable in its viewpoint and concludes with the statement that "the colony is doing the best it can to demonstrate a single tax within a multiple-tax state and country." The writer also says that he has watched with interest the growth of Fairhope for nearly thirty years.

BERNARR MCFADDEN, publisher of *Liberty*, who was invited to be present at the Memphis Henry George Congress, has written Secretary Williams saying that "it is very difficult at this time of stress and heavy business responsibilities for me to commit myself so far in advance. If you will designate some similar occasion in the near future in or around New York I will give you my answer." It is not impossible that Mr. McFadden may attend the Memphis conference.

A VERY thoughtful letter over a column in length favorable to the Single Tax, appears in the *Hartford* (Conn.) *Courant* from E. Le Roy Gardner. This is a new name to us, but he appears quite competent to discuss the question.

A NEW column is introduced in the *Progressive Labor News*, of Pasadena, Calif., and is conducted by George E. Lee. The column will bear the heading "Tax Minded," and Mr. Lee, judging from the first paper with which his column begins, seems to understand his economics.

OUR old friend J. E. McLean, author of "Spiritual Economics," has been recuperating at Pontiac, Mich., but now has returned to Fairhope much improved.

WE learn of the death of Durbin Van Vleck, of Brooklyn, long an earnest and devoted Single Taxer. Details are lacking.

THE *Chicago Daily Tribune*, of August 3, contained a letter from Mr. E. N. Nockels, Secretary of the Chicago Federation of Labor, on "Labor's Tax Programme." The letter was in answer to a writer under the nom de plume of "A Builder," who wanted to know why the leaders of organized labor "have refused to advocate a reduction in real estate taxes." Mr. Nockels' courageous reply reads in part:

"The answer is that the term real estate is a trick term that includes two different kinds of property—namely, property that is produced by labor, buildings, and property that was here long before man appeared on this planet. To scramble these two things together and call them real estate is as unscientific as it is dishonest in any one who poses as an instructor or advocate, and organized labor will denounce the fraud whenever it is given an opportunity.

"We are for exempting from taxation all things produced by labor, and if 'A Builder' has learned something from this reply he will join us and the Manufacturers and Merchants Federal Tax League in encouraging the production of wealth and discouraging speculation in land.

"One helps to employ labor, the other forestalls opportunities to employ labor."

THE *Kansas City Star* in an editorial "Is Germany Turning Back?," advanced the following as one of the reasons for the break between Chancellor Bruening and President Von Hindenburg: "He (Von Hindenburg) did not like the Chancellor's programme of breaking up the great landed estates in East Prussia for settlement by unemployed, which had infuriated the president's old aristocratic friends."

What's the Use of Working

By R. B. Brinsmade, B. S. E. M.

(Economist for Mex. Ministry of Finance, 1920-24)

A pamphlet which diagnoses Uncle Sam's troubles with parasites and prescribes two simple remedies—one political, one economic—for his disinfection.

Prices postpaid:

Single copies	- - - - -	10 cents
15 copies	- - - - -	\$1.00
60 "	- - - - -	\$3.00
100 "	- - - - -	\$4.50
200 "	- - - - -	\$8.00

LAND AND FREEDOM

150 Nassau Street

New York City

Tracts

	Single Copy	Per 10
Plain Talk on Taxation, by James R. Brown	5c.	\$3.00
Farmer and Single Tax, by James R. Brown	5c.	3.00
Pyramiding of Land Values, by James R. Brown	5c.	3.00
Not a Single Tax, by Charles T. Root	5c.	3.00
The Gasoline Tax, by James R. Brown	2c.	1.00
Single Tax, What It Is and Why We Urge It, by Henry George	5c.	3.00
The Ultimate Causes of Unemployment, by Warren S. Blauvelt	5c.	3.00
Thoughts on Natural Law in Civil Life, by John H. Scully	5c.	3.00
Causes of Business Depression, by Charles G. Merrell	3c.	2.00
The Philosophy of the Single Tax, by James F. Morton	3c.	2.00
Better Than Socialism, by James F. Morton	5c.	3.00
Natural Law in the Economic World, by Oscar H. Geiger	5c.	3.00

LAND AND FREEDOM

150 Nassau Street

N. Y. City

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

RADICALIA Civilization's Economy

\$1.50 Postpaid

Sold by S. TIDEMAN Fisk, Mo.

Henry George School of Social Science

(Supported by friends of the movement)

Opening Early in the Fall

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