

January—February, 1935

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Dictatorship or a Free Earth

Harry Weinberger

Prosperity a Normal Condition

Henry J. Foley

Land Value and Its Taxation

Henry L. T. Tideman

Are Conventions Worth While?

P. R. Williams

Book Reviews Correspondence News Notes and Personals

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax progress
Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York
JAMAICA OFFICE, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 170 Broadway, New York City

CHARLES JOSEPH SMITH, 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 sub-
scriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

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

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 1 WHOLE No. 188

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: A. Mathew ALONSO, Salamanca.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade,

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

INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	3
DICTATORSHIP OR SINGLE TAX.....Harry Weinberger	6
PROSPERITY—A NORMAL CONDITION..... Henry J. Foley	9
REFORMERS, RESPECTABILITY AND OFFICITISFrank Chodorov	14
LAND VALUE AND ITS TAXATION... Henry L. T. Tideman	16
THE ONLY PERMANENT CURE FOR UNEMPLOYMENTJ. C. Lincoln	17
WAYS AND MEANS.....Address by Anna George de Mille	19
HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.....	21
REPORT OF THE ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDA- TION.....Antoinette Kauffmann	23
ON THE MARCH WITH JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE....	24
ARE CONVENTIONS WORTH WHILE?.....P. R. Williams	25
PITTSBURGH NEWS.....	28
BOOK REVIEWS.....Grace Isabel Colbron and J. D. M.	28
CORRESPONDENCE.....	31
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	36

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 priors into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

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

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXV

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1935

No. 1

Comment and Reflection

IT is interesting to reflect how little real thought has characterized this era of experimentation. In all the linguistic fulminations and the stream of books that have come from the professorial groups prominent in the New Deal, how small is the element of reflection, of appeals to historic precedents, of research into the reasons for the failure of like social experiments with which the annals of nations are crowded. Not only have the advocates of democracy failed to voice their protests against the demonstrable economic errors of the present, but our scholarship, which might have drawn important lessons from the past, is silent as the grave. Everywhere we look we fail to discover a single eminent thinker whose words are sufficiently arresting to merit attention in this crisis. What is the matter with our system of education that so much of what we see everywhere in our legislative halls should go unchallenged?

HERE is another thought. Every generation provides its quota of economic works. We might say every decade. And ever so often these works are hailed by certain groups as epoch-making. But almost as quickly they are pushed off their eminence and drop into oblivion. Looking back into the late nineties we remember a few names that are as dead as last year's snows. Grunlund, Van Buren Denslow, George Gunton, Blatchford—conservatives and socialists alike—with many others that could be named are all forgotten. Yet what a noise they created in their day! Is there any greater assurance that Lippman, (though right once out of four times) Tugwell, Stuart Chase, Berle, Seligman, and all the flock of hybrid economists will meet with a dissimilar fate? Is there any difference between these men and their rather more popular and certainly more widely read predecessors? They are even duller, or most of them are, than those now consigned to oblivion. And they are a great deal more shallow.

THE trouble with them is that they do not know what they are writing about. Some of them are clever, but they have no fundamental knowledge of the things or laws they treat of. They have never really studied these problems. The very principles that would solve most of their difficulties are unknown to them. The few

who survive from earlier groups of economic thinkers are those who have in some measure contributed to principles. Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill emerge triumphantly and still survive. But how small is the number who merit even a second thought! Read Blanqui's *History of Political Economy* and note the names of those economists who spoiled much white paper and are now swallowed up. It reads like the epitaphs in a deserted cemetery. And if you look at what they wrote you will realize why they aroused the somewhat unreasoning anger of Thomas Carlyle. "Dismal" he called them. And you will have an answer to their disappearance.

AND because the writers of today on the problems of political economy and social science are all earmarked for oblivion—those we have named and legions of others—it behooves us rather to express sympathy than vent our anger upon them. For a veritable massacre at the hands of posterity awaits them. Let them not deceive themselves. The reputations of the nineties were greater than theirs by many degrees. And the time will come when even the casual reflections of Henry George will outweigh the tons of rubbish turned out in the name of social planning and economic philosophy.

A REVIEW by R. L. Duffus in the *New York Times Book Review* of recent date describes conditions prevailing in the Lowell cotton mills of years ago. The reviewer notes a report of a committee of the legislature which expressed the opinion that no legislation could provide a remedy, adding: "We look for it in the progressive development in the arts and sciences, in a higher appreciation of man's destiny, in a less love for money and a more ardent love for social happiness and intellectual superiority." This piously sloppy comment may give rise to a smile, but what shall we say of the reviewer who adds: "The profit system, as we might have foreseen, survived this insidious assault."

OF all the terms used to cloud understanding nothing quite equals "the profit system" unless it be "the capitalistic system." That at this time sixty years ago girls worked for twelve hours a day in the Lowell cotton mills at two dollars a week was due to something deeper than "the profit system," as "the profit system," so called, is due to something deeper still. That girls worked this

way for a meagre pittance was not due to the desire of the employers to make profits, but to the fact that labor was disinherited, and that the labor market was crowded. And the labor market was crowded because there were always enough girls out of work to provide the employer with a surplus to draw upon.

CONDITIONS were deplorable in the Lowell mills at that day and are still deplorable. But we are to remember that two dollars per week, which salaries were pitiable enough, were what six or eight dollars would mean today. There has been no great change in conditions. It is very likely that conditions are even slightly harder and more unbearable, though working hours have been somewhat reduced and surroundings somewhat improved. But at any rate wages in 1840 or of 1934 are not dependent upon what Mr. Duffus calls "the profit system," but in the number of girls out of work bidding for the jobs of those employed.

THE employer is not going to pay more than the market rate of wages, and these are not fixed by the desire of employers to secure profits, but upon labor conditions, chief among which is the number of men and women out of work, sufficient at all times to depress wages to the point of subsistence.

TO ask an employer to raise wages above the rate at which labor can be secured is to ask him to commit business suicide. He cannot pay higher wages than his competitors and continue in business. In exceptional instances he may be able to do this. Not so with the majority of employers. Employers everywhere are as much victims of the system as those who have only their labor. Both have to sacrifice a measure of their production, the wages of labor and the wages of superintendence—which is all there is in "the profit system"—to a third party who contributes nothing but land, which was here before Columbus, and the value of which the community creates.

WE do not have to invent terms for this partnership. It is all very obvious to those who will think. Mr. Duffus is quite capable of discerning it if he will. Let him ask himself how production can be carried on successfully with equitable shares going to this ill-assorted partnership. If a third partner who contributes nothing to industry levies upon this joint production less remains for those who make the entire contribution. Something must be deducted for the benefit of one who has no creative part or function in production.

THE Lowell mill owner or any other employer does not create this condition. The economic doctors at Washington have done a great deal to confuse the prob-

lem by code regulation of prices, and code regimentation, and have led our people to forget the natural forces at work, and to ignore the functions of a very simple problem. Not one of these economic doctors has risen to the occasion with cries of "stop thief" to the absconding partner in this strangely assorted company of labor, capitalists and landlord. Indeed their very effort seems to be to conceal the social crime of this barefaced embezzlement. To further bewilder our citizens curious verbal inventions that have no relation to realities are conjured up like "the profit system," or "the capitalistic system"—phrases borrowed from the socialists—that cloud the understanding, as we have said, and obscure the perfectly simple operation of an economic pocket-picking that goes on everywhere in the domain of industry.

THERE are three factors in production, land, labor and capital. There are three returns, rent, wages and interest. "Profits" is a bookkeeping term, but usually, as we have said, comprise or consist of the wages of superintendence. The proprietor of a store may receive all three returns, but the wages of superintendence, "profits" so-called, are his chief concern. And where his wages are high all wages are high. His profits are his wages when they are not economic rent. How absurd then to talk of "the profit system" when it is the wages system that is meant. And to advocate the abolition of the profit system is to advocate the abolition of wages, for anything that hits at the institution of profits is directed against all wages. Monopoly profits secured by the action of government in shutting out competition through patents or land ownership are another thing again, and are easily separable from real or legitimate profits. This will be made perfectly clear on analysis.

IN the arena of sports we at least hear the question, "Is it fair?" It comes up in prize fighting, horse-racing and base ball. "Is it fair?" Unless men and women ask themselves the question in the field of economics there will be no change. Justice, however, is a hardy virtue. It is a virtue of full grown men, not a civilization grown anaemic from long-time coddling under a wet nurse government. This government has visualized a citizenry that needs to be taken care of, rather than one to be set free. We shall perhaps pass through this era to one that will ask "Is it fair?" As justice not charity is the supreme law, justice demands a free earth not one in which we must pay others to live on or from.

THROUGH public speeches and writings Secretary Ickes has urged what he calls "stronger control over the economic forces that affect the common man." Economic forces, being presumably natural forces, are not susceptible of control by anybody, neither by govern-

ment nor by the individual. They may be followed or obeyed, but they are not obedient to any impertinent suggestion from us as to how they should behave. Economic forces have a way of their own; to try to control them is like trifling with a buzz saw. Pretty nearly all our troubles are due to attempted interference with them. To illustrate: It is an economic law that man seeks to gratify his desires with the least exertion. But we erect tariff walls to make it difficult to satisfy desires without a great deal of exertion, and above all we fence the land away from him, which makes it well nigh impossible to gratify any desire without great sacrifice. We constantly violate economic laws or forces, to our great sorrow and confusion, be it added.

SECRETARY ICKES is especially angry with the advocates of "rugged individualism." It is instructive to note how many well meaning emotionalists are under the tyranny of words. We exalt the "rugged individualism" of the pilgrims, of those who blazed the pathway to the great untrodden West. We still use the names of Daniel Boone and Sam Houston and many others. And the characteristics of those national heroes which we most admire are their rugged individualism. It was not until the Roosevelt administration that subtle assault upon the language began which seems gradually destined to deflate the meaning of terms. If we oppose any of the features of "economic planning" we are "Tories." The men who propose to hamstring industry are called "liberals," and those who question the wisdom of much that is being done or who would revert to the older and freer traditions of our country, are set down as "reactionaries." Has language no meaning any more? Must we accept new definitions in lieu of the old? Must we relinquish the dictionaries?

THEY are all alike, these strange planners who would ignore the plans of nature, economic laws planned from the beginning of the world. Listen to Mr. Ickes: "The meaning of the word liberty varies with time and circumstance. It may be said that the more civilized we become the greater must be the restriction placed upon the individual for the common good." And Mr. Richberg, who belongs to the same school of thinkers, referring to the critics of the New Deal: "They talk as though all rights were inherent in the individual. They are not. The rights of property did not come by nature, they were created by law."

JUST the contrary is true. All rights are inherent in the individual. It is not possible for government to create a right of property. That right began when the man of the stone age sharpened a piece of flint to spear a fish for his dinner and called that sharpened flint and

the fish his own. The rights of property exercised by government flow from the individual in whom all rights are inherent. Such rights as are exercised by government are *delegated rights*. It is quite clear that the social philosophy of the doctors at Washington is not only undemocratic—it is un-American. We venture to quote from Alexander Hamilton who said:

"The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments and musty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature by the hand of Divinity itself and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power."

WHAT is the real trouble with them we think we know. Let us quote Mr. Ickes again and see where his mental trouble is. He says: "It is easy to excuse these pioneer forefathers of ours who seeing before them apparently illimitable natural resources, proceeded to exploit these resources. We cannot hold it against them that they failed to foresee the seemingly inexhaustible provided by the bounty of nature would be nearing the point of exhaustion."

THESE inexhaustible natural resources are still practically inexhaustible. They have almost neared the point of *total appropriation*, but that is another matter. They may be recovered by any generation that has the wisdom and the courage to try it. And they will be. Nothing is more certain than the ultimate recovery of our natural resources by the people to whom they belong by that inherent right of property which both Mr. Ickes and Mr. Richberg fail to discern. These inherent rights are the right of property in what the individual creates and the right of the community to the value it creates, a right of property not law-created but inherent in the individual.

HOW both Mr. Ickes and Mr. Richberg come without meaning to do so to the defense of communism! For if the right of property rests only in the creation of man-made law then there is no real reply to communism. We shall not, however, so soon abandon the case. We will leave communism to its latest advocates, and we are sure that the well meaning groups of our communist friends who are blackguarded and defended in turn, will appreciate the arguments of their latest protagonists who tell them after all there is no real rights of property save that which the law creates. But ere the communist party proceeds to act upon the advice given them by their latest defenders, Messrs. Ickes and Richberg, we appeal to the communists to reflect that there is a sacred right of property that depends upon the creative right to the thing produced, a right of the individual's access to the earth, and the public's right to the public values it creates.

THIS is to be considered. As it is something not well understood it may be desirable to stress it. *If Roosevelt should succeed he must fail.* It is not possible of course to bring us out of the depression through the adoption of the devices entered into by the administration at Washington. But it is conceivable that natural forces may work something of revival to be followed by another era of depression, deeper and more general than that through which we are passing. For such temporary revival Roosevelt partisans will claim all the credit and he will be acclaimed as the great leader who has conquered the depression. But all to no purpose as time proceeds and the destructive forces again get in their work.

IT is all very simple to those who will study the matter. Land values are the lifeblood of the community. Normally they are beneficent in their operations. Business generally can carry the normal economic rent. Instead of being a burden on industry rent determines the most profitable locations where industry can be carried on. It marks the arteries of a city's commerce and determines the sites of a city's activities, the direction of its transit lines, the distribution of its population. Rents are the natural planning or the natural direction of it.

ANYTHING that interferes with the normal pulsation of land values through a city's arteries causes a disarrangement and interruption of the orderly processes of industry. The whole natural process is now destroyed and will not work because of the element now introduced. Speculation now sets in, and this speculation in rental values strikes at the very heart of the well-being of a community. An element is introduced destructive of all normal development. Industry is now called upon to pay in excess of the normal rent. There is less for interest and wages and more for the silent partner who contributes nothing to production, the receiver of economic rent, now speculative rent. Capital and wages face diminishing returns. Failures and bankruptcies follow and these results occurring from the same cause in other cities where similar phenomena are taking place, produce depressions. Finally the lifeblood of the community, land values, runs sterile.

THIS is the terrible cycle in which communities are involved. There is no remedy save the absorption by society of those social values which society creates, making forever impossible the recurrence of the present dislocation of industry and wide spread unemployment. This can be done through the taxing power. And at the same time all taxes which bear so hardly on industry can be abolished, and their abolition is the other half of the answer to the problem or solution for the condition in which we find ourselves. This need not be done at once

perhaps but can be done gradually, and with every step in the process capital and labor will be lightened of its burden.

Dictatorship or Single Tax^{*}

By HARRY WEINBERGER, of the New York Bar

A PEOPLE who are an-hungered cannot stay free. Occasional brave souls may starve and struggle to the end to maintain liberty and democracy. Large groups may fight while starving, and die in the struggle, it being:

"A short life in the saddle, Lord,
Not a long life by the fire."

For an entire nation, unemployment and starvation however will lead that nation inevitably to accept dictatorship in preference to hunger; whether that dictatorship is in the form of Fascism, Naziism or Communism.

Today the American people are engaged in a great struggle against economic depression—a struggle as great as the Revolution of 1776, a struggle as depressing as the Civil War of 1861, a struggle in some ways for millions of our people as horrible as the World War. If hunger and unemployment continue, will the blind Samson of hunger pull down the Temple of Civilization?

This present depression is testing whether our nation conceived in liberty, faced with world economic forces, can long endure without a dictator. Nation after nation has succumbed to regimentation or civil war. Will history recall that our democracy as well as that of other nations was only a passing phase to mark the transition from the divine right of kings to dictatorship?

Shall we allow that it is necessary to set aside the principles of individual freedom and regiment a nation in order to promote experiments to improve economic conditions. A small group in Russia, by force and terror, took from its people liberty, and promised to return it some day. More than fifteen years have elapsed since that time and liberty has not been returned to the Russian people. The Fascists of Italy and the Nazis of Germany have taken away liberty without even a promise of its return. They liquidate their opponents in Russia, castrate them in Italy, shoot them in Germany, put them in a Code in the United States as the opening step for a regimented nation. Only three of the great nations of the world are still really democratic—England, France and the United States.

If we have now in the United States a government of men and not law, if the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing freedom, protecting private property, protecting contracts, has been abolished or is in the process of being abolished, tomorrow or next year

^{*}This address of Harry Weinberger was sent to the Henry George Congress after he found it impossible to attend. Owing to the great amount of business before the sessions it was not read.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

instead of a mild idealistic President, we may have a dictator who will end all liberty, having been taught by an idealistic President how to regiment the people by force and fear in a time of depression and unemployment. Senator Borah well said:

"Precedents established by capable hands for desirable purposes are still precedents for incapable hands and undesirable purposes."

Life even with all economic questions solved, if without liberty, would be like a rope of sand which perishes in the twisting.

Every form of dictatorship in whatever guise it may come, must be resisted to the bitter end. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. This has been said thousands of times but always needs repeating, and never more than now.

It is better to die on fighting feet than to live on bended knees. We must not listen to men on bended knees—those who do so cannot judge the size of other men.

We must however solve the unemployment problem; solve the bread question, the cost of living question; the decent housing question, or people and nations in panic and desperation may continue to flock to dictators like frightened children. The youths of the United States stand helpless and hopeless asking for jobs, and in the most fertile land in the world, blessed with all the raw material necessary and the finest engineering science, marvelous roads and railroads, with millions of acres of land unused, trade stands still and millions are eating the bread of charity who never ate it before. Taxes are mounting higher and higher, taxes in every form; and once proud cities and states are turning to the Federal Government for aid lest they perish or go bankrupt.

In the meanwhile, almost without exception, cities, counties and states allow the unearned increment of land which is created by all the people to be taken by private individuals; it allows land to be held out of use waiting for a speculative rise in price; it fails to take for community needs the full rental value of the bare land which was created by no man, which act alone would force all land into its fullest economic use, create more jobs than men, raise wages, reduce the cost of living, lower rents, and abolish all relief rolls except for the old and feeble or incapacitated.

There can be no overproduction; there is only underconsumption. Today we have wonderful machinery making too much clothing so that millions are without clothes and without jobs. We have agriculture that produces so much wheat and corn and fruits and vegetables that millions have to go hungry; we have so many houses that millions are homeless. There is no limit to human consumptive power; there is only underconsumption caused by inability to purchase. There is no man, no matter how poor or how wealthy who cannot use hundreds of things, who would not like to own and use more of the

bare necessities of life, from simple bread to fine cake, from simple clothes to elaborate clothes, from newspapers to fine books, from ordinary pictures to masterpieces, from a simple harmonica to a fine violin, from an old tin-can piano to a grand piano, from a tallow candle to an electric light, from a one horse shay to the latest airplane or automobile, from a row-boat to a yacht, from a noisy city apartment to a beautiful home in the country.

When we had a tremendous housing shortage in New York City and rents were soaring to the skies, it was proposed that all houses built within a certain period would be tax exempt for ten years; that law of the exemption of houses from taxation was passed. Thousands of houses were built, the housing shortage was solved, hundreds of thousands of people were given jobs directly or indirectly and rents came down.

I need not state any of the usual arguments for Single Tax to most of this audience. However, let me give two examples, for others who may hear or read this address.

In the City of New York the New School for Social Research wanted to build a building on Twelfth street, and they paid two hundred thousand dollars for the mere fee of the land on which to erect the building. No one produced that land—no one except the community produced the value of that land, yet some one pocketed two hundred thousand dollars.

The Wendell home on Fifth Avenue and Thirty-Ninth Street, with its dog yard has been rented to a chain store at a rental of about three hundred thousand dollars a year, so that before labor can be paid a penny in wages, before capital can earn a penny in dividends, three hundred thousand dollars worth of goods must be produced yearly and paid over to the present owners of the land who inherited it from the Wendells.

This situation is repeated millions of times in the United States and often when labor strikes for more wages and shorter hours and capital replies it cannot afford it, then bitter strikes break out, leading to riots, disorder, deaths and the destruction of property. Capital and labor under these circumstances are very much like two Kilkenny cats who have had their tails tied together and are scratching and biting at each other, each thinking the other the enemy, while as a matter of fact, the real enemy is the one who tied their tails together. The enemy of both capital and labor are those who receive the community-created rental values of land.

The law of supply and demand cannot be repealed unless we go under a despotism, whether that despotism is called Communism, Naziism or N. R. A. That road means the destruction of democracy. The people of the United States may vote for it if they want it, for as Abraham Lincoln said in his first inaugural address:

"This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their con-

stitutional right of amending it or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

The change, however, must not be done by one man or a handful of public officials who were elected with no such mandate from the people, but it must be done by the people themselves.

Let us use all land to its fullest economic use, agricultural, industrial or residential. Let us use the full machine power, all science, all speed, all manpower as if we were at war. Continue under our present system. Tell the people of America that they can build houses, or repair them, build factories or barns, make improvements without having their taxes increased and unemployment will cease in America without begging the banks to make loans.

Break down and pull down the high tariff walls—raze them, so that other nations may do likewise, so that trade and goods may flow through the world again, so that nations will cease to fear that they cannot get raw materials for their people to eat or manufacture. Tariff walls cause nations to want more and more land of their neighbors, and they prepare for war while trade is not free. This preparation for war entails a burden that is like the Old Man of the Sea whom Sinbad carried almost to the point of his destruction.

How many additional men and women are on the public pay-rolls since the New Deal? I am not referring to relief rolls. What is the total amount of their unnecessary salaries? How many people are employed on code enforcements? How much spying is going on, how much added bitterness is being engendered? All of this an added incubus on business, increasing the cost of production, raising the cost of living without raising wages to permit the people to buy. These code authority employees are a new army of seven year locusts who at the expense of the public are eating up a good part of the people's substance. Put them back to useful work.

The American people should never again allow the destruction or limitation of crops or animals; never again allow the United States to adopt an economy of scarcity. A democracy should allow no poverty, no hunger, no involuntary unemployment, for every one in a democracy has an unalienable right to work for a living.

Economic liberty or proper distribution of wealth and the proper forms of taxation has nothing to do with the question of liberty. It has only to do with economics. But only a free people with liberty of speech under a democratic form of government, can change economic conditions by ballots instead of bullets, in order to bring about the happiness of the people, one of the purposes of government as stated in the Declaration of Independence.

Some men in a hurry to save the world before night-fall would dispense with all liberty. We stand against regimentation of the people under any guise or pretext. Voluntary cooperation is not despotism; compulsory cooperation carried too far may be the road to tyranny and tyranny is tyranny. We do not fear economic change—we

do fear the growth of monopolies and loss of liberty. We stand against the despotism of government or men. All changes of government or society should be fully discussed. We are not afraid of paper bullets containing ideas; we are not afraid of verbal shot containing controversial ammunition. It is so easy to sell one's heritage of freedom for a mess of pottage; the necessities, the exigencies seem so great, the sale seems so temporary—the struggle to hold it seems so hopeless, so useless.

You are familiar with the Rubiyat of Omar Khayam and know how he describes the sellers of wine and asks:

"Well, I wonder often what the vinters buy.
One half so precious as the stuff they sell."

To paraphrase Omar Khayam, I say to those in panic who are advocating that we sell liberty for a regimented state:

I wonder what they will receive that will
Be worth half the liberty they sell.

In Chicago at the World's Fair Exposition you may see the Prairie Schooner, also called the Covered Wagon, with its hard wheels and springs and brakes. As you look at it you may think of the men and women, who, because land was free and therefore opportunity was open, rode hundreds of miles in that wagon across country. You may wonder whether the men and women of today would have the courage to travel across a continent in a vehicle like that. Have we been softened by rubber tires, and fine springs on upholstered vehicles? Are we less industrious? Have we with all of electric and steam power less capacity to produce?

We refuse to say with Browning:

"Never glad, confident morning again."

We reply in the words of Bronte:

"No coward's soul is mine,
No trembler in the world's troubled sphere."

America is appalled at the spread of crime. Crime increases with the increased hazard of living. When young men and young women stand helpless and hopeless without jobs what can government and society expect? When middle age or old age finds itself desperate and in need, characters break under the strain and crime increases. When, added to that situation, there is the invasion of constitutional liberties by the law-enforcing agencies, the third degree, the invasions of homes, the dragnet arrests of alleged agitators or aliens or so-called "reds," all in violation of the law, we realize that the problem of much of all crime cannot be solved by law-enforcing agencies but by abolition of unemployment, starvation wages, the stretch-out system, long hours, but, more important than all, by opening opportunities creating a condition of more jobs than men.

We can care for the unemployed, we can feed the hungry and provide shelter for the homeless without

regimenting the nation in business, without goose-steeping every little industry, without leaving loose a bureaucratic flock of nosey incompetents running around clothed in brief authority, and with all the thunder of the majesty of the United States government behind them, giving petty orders—with the little man and the little business cracked down upon—while prices keep soaring for the necessities of life and business and individuals carry additional taxes and unemployment continues to grow with the number of those needing relief mounting. Food and grain and cotton and cattle have been destroyed in the past and people by tens of thousands have been paid for doing nothing. The government must take care of the needy. That is part of the duty of government. I defy any lawyer, however, to show any authority in the National Government to pay farmers for not producing, not working.

It is no disgrace nor dishonor to fail in the conflict for justice and liberty. It is only a disgrace and dishonor not to enter the arena and give battle. Democracy and parliamentary government with all its faults is the sole hope of a world seeking a possible solution of economic problems. If depotism conquers it will mould the world in unchangeable form; it will build on the masses for the benefit of only a few.

Luther Burbank once said:

"I shall be content if, because of me,
there shall be better fruits and fairer flowers."

We should be content if because of our battle for a free earth there shall be better human beings, peace, and the abolition of poverty, liberty and democracy in all the world.

So, take heart; consult your despair, your desperation in a tottering world; take heart for the earth in all its fruitfulness has not been destroyed. Tickle the earth and it will still laugh a harvest. Take heed for the learning and science of mankind, with all of steam and electric power, is still our heritage ready for use. Take heed—what should you fear? Our ancestors came from all parts of the world with courage, facing unknown conditions and dangers, helped clear a continent and established the glory of these United States. Can we do less?

Liberalism In Being

YES, there is a Liberal Party!

I saw nearly all of it all at once the other day. Three M.P.s stood in a group outside the Eisteddfod pavilion—all Liberals.

They were Captain R. T. Evans, A. O. Roberts and L. Jones.

The first estimated, in a talk with me that of the £10,000,000 recently spent on public works in Wales, half had gone to the landlords!

He might not go so far as to admit it, but the logical remedy, of course, is land reform on the Henry George pattern.

HANNEN SWAFFER in London *Daily Herald*.

POLITICAL juggling will not balance a budget.

Prosperity—

A Normal Condition

AN EFFORT TO FIND IN LIBERTY A COMMON
DENOMINATOR FOR THOSE NOT RESIGNED
TO DEPRESSIONS

BY HENRY J. FOLEY

Just what do you mean by prosperity?

I mean a condition in which every man able to work can secure without difficulty the necessities of life, and a reasonable share of the comforts and luxuries.

Is prosperity a condition difficult of attainment?

Prosperity is as normal as breathing. Depression is as unnatural, and should be as unusual as suffocation.

Why do you say that prosperity is a normal condition?

Because men were provided with the earth and its raw materials, from which all their wants may be supplied, just as they are provided with air to breathe; and they are likewise provided with hands to work up these materials, just as they are provided with lungs to breathe the air.

How could the normal condition of breathing be replaced by the unnatural condition of suffocation?

1. By destroying the lungs with which men breathe, or,
2. By shutting off the air which they must put into their lungs.

How could a normal condition of prosperity be replaced by depression and wholesale poverty?

1. By destroying the hands with which men work; or,
2. By keeping men away from the materials on which they could work.

Is prosperity the actual condition of mankind?

Some of the best minds assure us that unemployment and low wages must be perpetual.

Is this because men have lost the use of their hands?

Certainly not; it must be for the other reason, that they have nothing to use their hands upon.

Does the cure of depression require a deep study of political economy?

If it did, the human race would have been extinct before the population reached a thousand.

Does the human race need employers?

If it did, Adam would have died in a poorhouse, if there had been a poorhouse. There was no "capital fund" to pay Adam's wages.

Is the problem of making a living a dreadfully complicated problem?

The problem of working for something to eat should be no more complicated than the problem of eating.

What has complicated the problem of making a living?

The fact that the majority of people are barred

from any right to a place to make a living, and must work for some one else, if possible.

Can a man of ordinary intelligence understand the cause of depression?

Yes, if he can understand this statement: A man who is forbidden to work can not make a living.

Is poverty caused by a scarcity of the good things of life?

The good things are apparently so plentiful that they must be burned or buried.

What causes wholesale poverty while good things are so over-plentiful?

The fact that some men have the privilege of taking, and do take, as much as they wish, leaving very little for the others.

How do people get this power to take?

Through the possession of some special privilege, monopoly; monopoly of gas or water or electricity, monopoly of food or of some branch of industry.

Is there any other way in which people could get the power to take an unfair share?

There is absolutely no other way. Without monopoly, every worker could insist upon, and could secure, a fair share of production, i. e., fair wages.

What is the immediate cause of depression?

Wages are so low that workers can not buy the good things, production must stop, and workers are thrown out of work.

What makes wages low?

The fact that workers must bid for jobs, against unemployed people who must get work or starve.

How does it come about that men are unemployed?

Because government takes the most effective means of barring them from work.

Is there any law on the statute books barring any class of men from the right to work?

No; but the thing is done more effectively by allowing some men the privilege of barring others from work, and of charging without limit for allowing them to work.

There is something refreshingly novel in Mr. Foley's presentation. There are those unable to follow the economic reasoning fortifying our contentions, but we are certain they can understand the statement, "They have denied you a place to work. Land is a place to work."

Mr. Foley is a student of the Henry George School and loves economic discussions. But he is confident that the common man can comprehend our teachings without resort to them. He is the author of articles which ran serially for nearly forty weeks in *The Gaelic American* outlining his position.

The new students of our movement are bringing to us some unfamiliar concepts that are new in our philosophy. Charles H. Johnson, a convert of Henry George Atkinson and a student of the Henry George School under the beloved Oscar H. Geiger, gives us this: "Men are all agreed that air, sunlight and water are not property. Then why not land as well, since without air, sun and water land is of no use and therefore of no value? Is it not a little curious that we regard as private property something which has no value save as it is created or enhanced by what we are agreed is *not* property?" Is not this thought worth remembering?—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

How is this accomplished?

By allowing individuals the right to control land.

What does the private ownership of land now include?

It includes the right to control the labor and the lives of those who do not own land, and to appropriate their earnings with absolutely no legal limit.

Why is this plan more effective than a law forbidding men to work?

Because men might evade a law and go to work but they can not evade a man who can make money by charging them for a place to work.

Could not government force wages up in spite of the private control of land?

The law of supply and demand is a natural law, as resistless as the law of gravitation. A stone dropped from a balloon will fall to the ground, and fifteen million men with no place to work will depress wages, in spite of any government regulations. A government which supplies an unlimited amount of helpless labor to the demands of employers must expect unemployment and low wages.

What does the present land system do to the labor market?

It constitutes a most effective "dumping" of the labor of the nation.

Has any government ever succeeded in regulating wages?

Not unless it first abolished every trace of liberty, as in ancient Peru and in modern Russia. Of course, any slave owner can divide his wealth among his slaves as he sees fit, and any nation which abolishes liberty can, and must, regulate production, and dictate the distribution.

Would not business and industry become oppressive in a democracy without government planning and regulation?

If men were given access to the earth and its raw materials, and protected from monopolies, they could, and would, refuse to be exploited. Industry would be restricted to bidding for workers to keep the industries going.

What is it necessary for government to do to prevent oppression and unemployment?

Only these two things:

1. The negative duty of leaving men free to work.
2. The positive duty of preventing any one from interfering with the equal freedom of every man.

Could not the poor still be oppressed by the rich if all were free to use the land on equal terms?

A million men with a billion dollars each could not oppress the poorest man on earth if that man were free to make his own living, by having access to the earth and its raw materials. The president of all the holding companies could no more oppress a western farmer or a city merchant than he could keep the arctic fox from making a living.

How can the farmer or the merchant be exploited at present?

When land monopoly bars him from the land he

looks for work, and the employer allows him to bid for a job against a million other people similarly situated.

Is it only farm workers who suffer from this oppression?

It applies equally to every one who lives by service. The president of Schulte Retail Stores Corporation denies that the reason for closing four of its stores in New Orleans was restrictive legislation. He says: "The reason for closing the stores was that the rents were more than we could pay." The clerks, and perhaps some of the stockholders, may now look for jobs and help to bid wages down.

Which is the most flagrant of all the monopolies?

The private ownership and control of land.

Why is this the worst of all the monopolies?

1. Because it bars the people from work by denying them a place to work, and leaving them to "look for jobs."

2. Because it "dumps" the labor of the people who are able to find work, by forcing them to bid against other people who must either underbid the workers or starve.

3. Because it furnishes all the other monopolies with a world of helpless human material on which to operate.

Could not other monopolies oppress the people even if the land monopoly were destroyed?

They might temporarily exact unfair prices for their products, but they could not keep people out of work, nor hire workers for unfair wages.

What else would limit the exactions of monopolies?

If people had access to the land they could get their own necessities. Other products, such as manufactures, they could do without until prices came down to a fair level.

Should the government disregard other monopolies?

Government should end all monopolies. But the abolition of land monopoly would remove most of the power for mischief which other monopolies now possess.

Is depression caused by the fact that some people have too much wealth?

Wealth in itself is powerless to oppress anybody.

What is the connection between great wealth and depressions?

Depressions are caused not by great wealth, but by control of opportunities. This control causes swollen fortunes, which give rise to further monopolies, resulting in more swollen fortunes, ad infinitum; a perfect vicious circle.

Could depression be cured by dividing the wealth equally?

No. If every man were plentifully supplied with money the monopolists would raise their prices and the land owners would raise their rents. The swollen fortunes and the bread lines would be restored without delay.

Who are the best propagandists for communism?

The landowners and other monopolists.

Why are these more effective as propagandists than the Third International?

Because they are demonstrating to the unemployed and to the underpaid that there is no way in which they can make a living except by dividing the wealth.

How does communism propose to bring Utopia?

By doing away with all private property.

Is there any sound reason for abolishing private property?

If private control of opportunities were ended every one could make as good a living as he cared to work for, and there would be no one rash enough to suggest that the workers divide with the drones.

Who should be the most ardent advocates of equal opportunities for all, and equal access to the land?

The wealthy, who have the most to lose by the threatened abolition of all private property.

What is communism?

Rule by the working classes.

Is it really?

No. Only in theory. In practice it is an absolute dictatorship.

What developed communism?

The well-verified conviction by the workers that there was no way in which they could secure justice except by seizing the power of the state.

Were they correct in this conviction?

No. They could have secured justice and prosperity by voting for freedom of opportunity, and the rights of all to a place to work.

What is fascism?

Fascism is rule by the upper classes.

How did fascism arise?

When Italy, e.g., saw the terrible effects of rule by the socialists in Russia, she decided to forestall its spread by placing all power in the hands of the upper classes, and keeping the working classes permanently helpless.

Which of the two forms of government, communism or fascism, is more desirable?

Both are complete and practicable working forms of tyranny, one disguised, and the other unashamed. "A plague on both your houses."

What is the American form of government?

It is rule by all the citizens, each one as free and as powerful as any other.

Is the American plan workable?

It is workable so long as men are really free. A permanent democracy is impossible where workers are helpless to work without the consent of employers.

What is the greatest danger to the freedom of a free people?

The greatest danger is a lack of freedom. "The cure for the troubles of democracy is more democracy."

Please explain this more fully.

In a free country where people have no right to work for a living, living conditions become unbearable. The victims attribute this to the form of government, and democracy is swept away in a flood of communism or fascism.

Are these your conclusions?

No. This is only modern European history.

What is the greatest objection to communism?

It must begin with the complete destruction of liberty.

What is necessary to end unemployment and low wages, without communism?

Absolutely nothing except liberty, including the right to a place to make a living, and to the raw materials of the earth.

Is there any hope of ending wholesale poverty while land monopoly persists?

It is as hopeless as to expect that a man will become wealthy while other people are allowed to take his earnings without limit.

Could not prosperity be assured by the control of other monopolies without interfering with the land system?

If other reforms could put every man to work at high wages, "land values" would rise by the exact amount of the increase. In other words, the landowners would pocket the entire increase.

Why is not private control of land universally recognized as a monopoly?

Because the ownership of land is so widespread that even some poor people own land.

Does not this widespread ownership take land out of the monopoly class?

To the fifteen million Americans who have no work, and no right to a place to work, it makes no difference whether the ownership of the land is in one man or a million men.

Can it be possible that landowners are victims of the land system?

They are, by thousands. Every landowner who must work for a living is a victim of the depression, either in low wages or in unemployment. A deed to a house or farm is no cure for a depression.

Is it ownership of land that causes unemployment?

No. Unemployment and low wages are caused by *control* of land, with the privilege of barring others from access to the earth.

Is control of land necessary to encourage industry and thrift?

No. To encourage industry and thrift it is only necessary that men have security in the possession of land.

How could government give men security in the possession of land, and at the same time prevent this harmful control of land?

By government making a reality of the law of eminent domain, and taking the rental value of the land as a consideration, the same as any other proprietor does.

Could not the people in possession of land still control land and force unemployment if government took the rental value of its land?

No. The landowner now forces unemployment by holding the land idle until a satisfactory tribute has been paid. He could not afford to hold land idle if he had to pay the annual value to the government. Idle land would be thrown on the market the price of all land would fall, and the unemployed could use it to make a living.

Is the system of private land control as vicious as the old system of slavery?

The right to force people into unemployment and starvation is just as vicious as any system of individual slavery, and by so much more mischievous as it is disguised.

Would the removal of land monopoly inevitably bring prosperity?

Giving men the right to work, and a place to work would cure unemployment and low wages as obviously as the giving of food would cure starvation.

Will you describe the steps by which equal access to the land would bring prosperity?

To describe all the good effects of letting men work, and letting them keep the fruits of their work, would require a volume larger than an unabridged dictionary. It would take longer than to tell the things a starving nation could do if they were fed.

Will you give an outline of the effects of government collecting all the rent of land?

Yes, but I must restrict it to a few of the effects of freedom, including only those effects so obvious that they are beyond dispute, and rigidly excluding any flights of fancy.

1. If the holders of idle land continued to hold it idle they would pay the full yearly value to the state, thus largely relieving other citizens of the payment of taxes. Of course no landowners would continue to hold land idle. They would put it into production, or surrender it.

2. If they surrendered it, the now unemployed could use it to make a living; farm land to grow food, or city land to start a business.

3. If the owners put the land into production they would have to employ men.

4. Bearing in mind that the annual rental value of land is collected by the government, the land would not be free, but the speculative values would be squeezed out, the lowest grade of land now in use would have no rental value, and all other land would be cheapened in proportion.

5. Every piece of land put into production would require building, giving rise to employment, and solving the unemployment problem.

6. If any unemployed were left, (which would be very unlikely), they would have an abundance

of good land on which to make a living, free of taxes, or with only nominal taxes.

7. The above results would be cumulative. Every parcel put into production would give employment to builders. Men put to work would buy food, clothing and shelter, speeding up business in all directions.

8. The chaotic tax system, now running wild, would be wiped out, and the values produced by land would pay all the taxes, and every man's earnings would be left to him in their entirety.

9. The bureaucracies now smothering the American people, with their mountains of taxes, would be done away with. People free to make their living would need no bureaus.

Why have all the efforts of reformers to abolish poverty gone for nothing?

Because each one has concentrated on some symptom instead of looking to causes. Their scattered efforts have nullified each other, while the monopolists have gathered in the spoils.

How do these efforts work out in practice?

The ineffectual cries for myriads of reforms, many of them contradictory, have about convinced the nations that reform is an impossible dream, that political economy is the dismal science, and that the poor must be always with us.

Will not these multiplied efforts of reformers finally abolish poverty?

The same kind of efforts, continued during the next thousand years, will see the same results, accelerating unemployment and poverty.

Is there any disagreement among the monopolists?

The monopolists have been able to work together with a harmony that would put the early Christians to shame. They have a common meeting ground, a common denominator, to which everything else must defer, and which coordinates all their activities.

What is the common denominator of the exploiters?

That a helpless people, barred from any right to work for themselves, shall be at the mercy of the exploiters.

Do the exploiters never quarrel among themselves?

Oh yes; but only over the division of the spoils. It would be unwise for a pirate band to quarrel before the ship has been looted.

Could people interested in abolishing poverty find a common denominator?

They could find a common meeting ground in fighting for liberty, the equal rights of all men to the use of the earth on equal terms.

Would any reformer have to abandon his pet reform by adopting this common denominator?

He might be able to introduce his favorite reform, if it is a genuine reform, when men are once free to work. It is a hopeless job to introduce any

reform in a country where men have no right to work, and where fifteen million men can not even find work at low wages. Men on a bread line want work, not lectures on economics or politics.

Could Jews and Christians concentrate on this plan?

Every real religion is based on belief in the brotherhood of men. A Jew or a Christian who believes in shutting out his brother from a chance to work is below the pagan in morality.

Could communists join in this policy?

If a man desires to divide up the wealth of the world, it would certainly seem logical for him to begin by giving all men equal rights in the earth.

Could government planners unite on freedom of the land?

Government planning might get somewhere after men have been given the right to work, and have gone to work. Government plans to bring prosperity to men forbidden to work are more Utopian than Utopia.

How about the battlers for good government?

Governments were instituted among men to promote life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness. Liberty to make a living was not specifically expected. The word "government" applied to a system which bars its people from the right to work is poetic license.

How about the patriots fighting for the liberties of their conquered homelands?

If land monopoly were abolished the conquering heroes would find their occupation gone. The first aim of the conqueror is to monopolize the land, not for the conquering nation, but for the war lords. The first doctrine of patriots throughout the world should be that the land of a nation belongs to the people of that nation.

Moreover, political freedom without economic freedom, without the right to make a living, is an empty formula. The domestic exploiter can be just as merciless and grinding as the foreign war lord.

Should welfare workers work for the right of the people to the land?

It would be a heartless thing to say that all the charity work is love's labor lost; but the millions of dollars donated by private persons, the millions collected by the St. Vincent de Paul Societies and the Salvation Army, from people who can ill afford them, and the billions expended for relief by the United States Government, all these find their way to the strong boxes of the exploiters as inevitably as the rain on the mountain top finally comes to rest in the ocean.

The exploiters have been given power to take, and there is no magic to keep from them the millions collected for charity. The result of land monopoly is to leave the people as a maximum, the bare cost of living, and the exploiter automatically

subtracts that amount from the wages that must otherwise be paid.

If men were once more free to work, the labors of the charitable societies could be concentrated on the widows, the orphans, and the helpless, and the job could be done thoroughly and handsomely. They are now engaged in filling a bottomless pit.

Why have all the efforts of government and of philanthropists failed to bring prosperity?

Because they are engaged in an undertaking which is physically impossible. Public prosperity and private control of land are a contradiction in terms. Nothing can ever make men prosperous while their earnings may be taken in advance and without limit for a permit to work.

Is there any mystery connected with depression?

Yes. The mystery of why fifteen million men who are barred from work are out of work; and the mystery of why workers who must bid against these fifteen million unemployed find their wages low; and the mystery of why the American people have not recognized the vicious land system as the inevitable cause of the depression.

Would it be a serious matter to abolish the private control of land?

Yes; but it will be a more serious matter to continue unemployment and poverty and depression until the end of the world. And communism is rather a serious matter.

Reformers, Respectability and Officitis

MOSES did not choose to be respectable. Had he done so, the greatest reform movement in history would never have happened. He might have advocated some ameliorating measures for Jewish slaves, such as shorter hours, or better housing conditions, or maybe even a minimum wage. In advocating such things he could have maintained a comfortable place among the ruling group, of which he was a member, he would not have violently offended the Pharaohs, and thus would have retained his personal comfort and importance. Perhaps he might have made the condition of his co-religionists somewhat less repulsive. But they would still be slaves. Their degraded position would in time have weakened their resistance to the idolatry of the Egyptian religion. Indeed, during the Exodus it was the degenerating influence of their past environment that caused him so much concern, and it was only because of his genius as a leader and moulder of opinion that he was able to overcome this influence. Several generations of slavery produce a people that is akin to a domesticated animal—entirely subservient to a master. Realizing the growing decadence of his people

Moses did not propose any change that would ease their thralldom; he chose the difficult course of revolt, with a consequent loss of respectability.

Respectability in a reformer consists in attempting to slightly alter the condition of the people without depriving the predatory group of their vested interests. Their slaves were the vested interests of the Egyptian landlords. The latter might have tolerated some humane suggestion for easing the condition of their slaves, provided the institution of slavery were not abolished. In our time, we find the House of Representatives advocating old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, community chests, collective bargaining—"social improvements" of one kind or another that do not in the slightest affect their vested interests and monopoly privileges. Such political reformers as Roosevelt and Tugwell and Ickes et al are quite within the sphere of respectability in advocating these innocuous measures. They do not risk their social or political prestige by advocating the application of a salve to the sore-covered hide of the slave, provided they do not threaten the institution. Social ostracism is visited only on those who attempt real reforms—that is, reforms that aim to deprive the privileged class of their privileges. Moses was determined to free the Jews, and therefore he lost caste with the Pharaohs. The Roosevelts of our day have no intention of breaking with our Pharaohs; they are respectable.

Jesus was not crucified because of his ethical teachings. His martyrdom (unless we accept the theory of vicarious atonement) was the direct result of his attack on the vested interests of the Jewish priests. Had he let them continue their money-changing in the temple unmolested, he might have continued without interference the performance of miracles and the teachings of the "other cheek" philosophy. But Jesus realized that the spiritual degradation of the Jews, and the consequent loss of their political independence, was the direct result of their poverty, and that this was caused by the selfishness of their rulers. A true reformer does not deal with effects; he seeks to eradicate causes. In doing so, if he is really a great man, he is influenced neither by the interests he attacks nor the consequences upon himself. Jesus' unrespectability cost him his life. He did not lay the blame for the priests' wrong-doing upon a "system;" he did not condone their greed on the ground that the laws of the land permitted it. He did not try to change the laws. He accused the priests of personal guilt. Sin is always personal; there is no institutional sin. If the law permits me to deprive other people of their property, that fact does not exonerate me from the crime of robbery. Society simply is too stupid to recognize the crime and to visit punishment upon me. The great reformer aims to show society that my acts are in fact criminal; having done so, restrictive and retributive regulations follow. Jesus' attacks upon the priests

was personal. He was unrespectable, and therefore effective.

The great reformers of all times were those who attacked personally the beneficiaries of an iniquity. When a reform movement ceases to attack, when it seeks to make changes surreptitiously so as not to shock sensibilities, when it attempts to provide soft couches for those it aims to knock down, when it tries to coddle harlots into virtuous living, when it woos the interests it aims to destroy and accepts their bribes, then that reform is doomed. The success of the socialist movement—a success that must be measured by the general acceptance of its impossible philosophy, even by those who cling to the hope that by some magic of words Marxism and individual freedom can be reconciled—is due to the fact that it has never ceased to attack the predatory interests. In the sense that it will rectify social and economic maladjustment socialism can never succeed. It is a false philosophy. But in spite of the falseness of their philosophy, socialists have been eminently successful in having it tried, even in our country where the traditions of individualism were thought to be of the people. Why? Because socialists never were respectable. They always attacked, viciously, relentlessly, even fanatically.

The failure of the Henry George movement—a failure that is attested not only by the paucity of the number of its adherents, but more because every political measure that is advanced throughout the world aims to entrench the system of private land ownership, showing that Henry George's teachings are of no influence whatsoever—the failure of this movement to gain headway is due solely to its proneness for respectability. We cannot escape this conclusion, unless we accept the position that the philosophy itself is lacking in truth, a position which even the opponents of the Single Tax do not altogether take. The very nicety of Henry George's logic has been the means taken by those who professed to believe it—if the movement has had leaders, who were they?—to soften its attack on the privilege it aims to destroy.

Henry George himself was a courageous reformer. His proposal is a deadly attack on the most vicious and most powerful vested interest the world has ever known—the private ownership of the earth. Never did he soften this attack, never did he fail to point out that those who own the land own those who live on it. He compared land owners to slave owners. He accused land speculators of causing hard times. The polish of his phrases and the perfection of his logic only accentuated the viciousness of his attack. In the presentation of his revolutionary idea, either in printed word or on the platform, he did not compromise, nor did he hold any hope for those whose privilege he aimed to destroy, or suggest any method for easing their pain. He was

unscrupulously attacked by the land owners, he was even jailed. He was not respectable.

But George was greater as a reformer than as a leader. He seemed to have lacked political vision. His understanding of human frailties, it is now evident, was as deficient as his grasp of economic truths was great. For, when he deliberately led his followers into the Democratic Party (that was, and is, as much a bulwark of privilege as is the Republican Party) because Cleveland said something about reducing tariffs, he injected into the Single Tax movement a poison that for fifty years has sapped its energy and reduced it to its present state of innocuous desuetude. That poison is *Officitis*—that which there is no seductive siren, whiskey nor narcotic more weakening to the moral fibre of a reformer.

Every great writer, who is at all prolific, has produced something which is mediocre. But George did more than that in one chapter of one of his great books. He laid the ground work for the very disintegration of the movement in the chapter entitled "Practical Politics" in "Protection or Free Trade." The illogic of that chapter would induce one to believe it an interpolation were not the style truly Georgean. His argument throughout the book is that international free trade can have no beneficial bearing on economic or social conditions unless we have free trade among individuals, and he points out that free trade England did not remove poverty there because of this inadequacy. And then, in this chapter, he argues that Single Taxers should join the Democratic Party (which, he must have known, was financed by the landed aristocracy) because it professed a desire to lower tariffs—"as an entering wedge." Surely some evil genius—or was it some politically minded friend?—must have directed his pen in the writing of this chapter.

The joining of forces with a political party that is supported by privilege was (unwittingly on George's part) a concession to respectability—and when a reformer makes that concession his cause is doomed. The first concession is the prelude to others, and the progressive dilution of a great truth makes it akin to a falsehood. Had George been followed by a Moses or a Jesus the evil results of his tactical error would have been averted. Unfortunately, no such dynamic personality has as yet taken up his cause. There have been a number of brilliant orators and teachers of his gospel, the most prominent and capable of whom were more influenced by the erroneous method he suggested (we know it was erroneous) than by his own honesty and singleness of purpose. Not that these men were not wholehearted in their advocacy of the Single Tax. But Henry George's first concession in principle—that is, the possible adoption of free trade as a means toward the goal of economic liberty—made possible further concessions on the part of his followers. In proposing such things as the "Single

Tax Limited," (which is Single Tax only by devious reasoning), in spending so much effort toward securing initiative and referendum laws, in devising sly measures for shifting the tax burden—"sly" because the obvious idea was to avert the accusation that such measures might tend toward the breaking up of land monopoly—these men were unconsciously influenced by George's political mistake rather than by George's uncompromising philosophy. So much so that some so-called stalwart Single Taxers—they would themselves lay claim to being so-called—have been advocates of such incongruities as income taxes and inheritance taxes, NRA and government ownership. The process of seeking respectability has become so complete as to remove all taint of being reformers.

But more vicious than the vitiating of the singleness of his proposal by this concession was his weakening of the morale of his most accomplished disciples by making politicians of them. It is an axiom that politicians prefer office to principle. A statesman (in theory at least) will go down with his policies, but a politician will abandon an entire platform if need be to retain his position. The thought that Single Taxers in office, elected on a platform that is diametrically opposed to the Single Tax, or appointed to office by those elected on such platform, might do more for the advancement of the philosophy than can the independent reformer is quite erroneous. It is, in fact, dishonest to expect them to do so. The party in power is there because it has promised the people to do certain things; to do other things, like enacting the Single Tax, which it did not promise, is to violate a sacred trust. Every member of the party, no matter how insignificant the post he holds, is in duty bound to carry out its political promises; he is a traitor to this trust who advocates anything else. Most likely every Georgist who has held office has harbored the hope that he might sometime induce his party to write the Single Tax into its platform. A sort of "boring from within" plan. This is an obvious impossibility, since both of the dominant parties in this country are controlled by privilege through the vital nerve centers of their campaign funds. Besides, it is ridiculous to expect a political party to adopt a principle for which there is no public clamor. When, therefore, the Single Taxer achieves public office and discovers that his advocacy of this fundamental reform is at variance with the policies of his party, and may militate against his continuing on the public payroll, he finds it more politic to subdue his reforming proclivities. This is not dishonesty of purpose; it is that pardonable human frailty—Officitis. The office overcomes the man. That is why the very able disciples of Henry George who followed his suggestion of joining the Cleveland Democracy accomplished nothing toward the advancement of the Single Tax, not even to the extent of increasing a knowledge of the philosophy. As office holders they became Democrats first and Single Taxers

thereafter. This is not said in a spirit of rancor or even criticism, for this metamorphosis of the reformer to respectability is, in a politician, as easy as it is inevitable. As a matter of fact the prominent Georgists who became Democratic office holders did damage to the advancement of the cause; for their silence in high places, and their circumspection in all places, caused their less fortunate and adulating co-believers to also subdue their demand for a liberated earth to the mere whisper for a shift in taxes, so that the ordinary citizen, who may have listened to these erstwhile preachers in pre-office days, ceased to take interest in this great truth now diluted. Jehovah must always be omnipotent; when his high priests explain and modify Him he is no longer Jehovah.

Time, the great healer, is gradually undoing the damage done to his cause by George's tactical error. Because of its fundamental truth and its greatness of purpose his philosophy has survived; also because throughout the years a few bold ones persisted in preaching it in all the purity of its promise. Had these few honest souls been aided by those whose Single Tax beliefs were submerged by their political affiliations—and these were, on the whole, of greater abilities—perhaps the great truth would by this time have achieved wide public acceptance. But time has removed most of those who claimed the mantle of George. The hope of the movement is in a new generation who will pursue their own methods and tactics, uninfluenced by the errors of the past. To them the disputes between the purists and the respectables will be unknown. They will get their knowledge from the inspired pages of "Progress and Poverty"—where the truth is revealed in all its purity—and not from the modifiers, whose words are even now almost forgotten. And sometime, somewhere, from among these disciples will arise a Moses who, thoroughly unrespectable and immune to the disease of Officitis, will demand in a voice loud enough to be heard complete freedom from slavery; whose genius for leadership will make possible the era of human progress promised by Henry George. And he will probably be crucified.

FRANK CHODOROV.

Land Value and Its Taxation

By HENRY L. T. TIDEMAN

THE challenge of Frank Stephens, based I presume on the basis of his enclavial experience, on the impossibility of making effective effort to take ground rent into the public treasuries, calls for an answer.

How often the question has been asked: How can you levy taxation upon land values when the Single Tax will have destroyed land values? And how often it has been answered! But, once again this question arises from, and is itself involved in a too free use of words. If anyone believes that the taxation of land values will "destroy" the selling price of land, he should take time

out to study the matter. The word "destroy" has a definite meaning. It does not belong in the question. The Single Tax will not destroy the selling price of land capable of producing ground rent. The only lands the selling price of which will be destroyed will be the body of lands that will constitute the new margin of cultivation when land speculation is made unprofitable.

That the taxation of land values by the Single Tax method will reduce the selling value of lands is not in dispute. That the Single Tax will destroy land values except as they are fictitious, is nonsense.

Let us look at the detail of the extreme application of the Single Tax. Assuming that the current rate of interest on investments is six per cent, and taking the instance of a piece of land the ground rent of which is \$1,060. Let us assume that the tax levy requires a tax of \$1,000 to be paid.

We have

Ground Rent - - - - -	\$1,060
Tax - - - - -	\$1,000
<hr/>	
Net ground rent remaining - - - - -	\$ 60
Value of land paying \$60 net to its holder is	\$1,000
Tax rate, then is (1,000/1,000) - - - - -	100%

Such a lot in Chicago at the present time and under the present taxing system will pay:

Ground Rent - - - - -	\$1,060
Tax - - - - -	\$ 265
<hr/>	
Net ground rent remaining - - - - -	\$ 795
Value of land paying \$795 net to its holder is	\$13,250
Chicago's tax rate at present is - - - - -	2%

Now, as a practical matter, do the assessing officials dig into private affairs to discover the ground rent received by this landholder? Of course not. They make an appraisal, as best they can, of the selling value of the land, and put it on their books. That is all that will be necessary under the most extreme application of the Single Tax.

The nicety of perfection not attainable in the construction of machinery, in art and in the control of physical forces, in all of which activities we think in terms of our ability to control the details of process and structure, should not be expected to result from even the wisest adjustment of human institutions to the need of men who wish to be free.

Even under the influence of the Single Tax, small leaks of economic rent into the purses of landholders and their lessees will occur. What of it? Under a condition that prevents land speculation and monopoly, and when most folks will be landholders, and all others free to become so, small inequalities will be of such little consequence that they may best be left as matters of conscience.

Now for a few moments on the subject of interest. The controlling law here is that "men seek to satisfy

their desires with the least possible exertion." All borrowing is voluntary, as is lending.

In production, time is an element. It cannot be avoided. When present possession of products useful to production gives advantage over future possession, if that advantage is sufficiently great, a borrower enters the market. Both the borrower and the lender operate under the law of least exertion. Sometimes the borrower "rents" a building or other product, directly from its owner, sometimes indirectly through a banker.

As the result of my useful work, I have possession of a thousand dollars. This means to me, and it is a fact, that all of the varieties of products in the market, \$1,000 worth of them belongs to me. I lend my \$1,000 to a borrower. I may believe, and the borrower also, that I am lending him the \$1,000. I am not. I am permitting him to use products belonging to me that are still in the market because I have not claimed them.

When men go through the forms of borrowing to secure the use or possession of land, a different problem arises, but it has no relation to the subject of interest. And it is in this field of study where confusion on the subject of interest arises.

The Only Permanent Cure For Unemployment

By J. C. LINCOLN

EVERY community, by its presence and activity, creates a fund which is the natural source from which its expenses should be drawn. This fund is ground rent. For instance, there is a little candy store on Euclid Avenue, in Cleveland that rents, I am told, for \$2,000 per year, per foot. It is very clear that this \$2,000 per year, per foot, is a community product which is appropriated by the owner of the fee to the property. It is further clear that this \$2,000 per year, per foot, produced by the community and appropriated by the fee owner, defrauds the community by just this amount. Our present land laws make it legal for fee owners to defraud the community by appropriating the community-created ground rent to the extent of twelve or thirteen billion dollars per year in the United States. This fund is ample to take care of reasonable governmental expense.

A little thought will make it clear that the selling value of land is the ground rent, actual or expected, capitalized and the amount of this ground rent in such a city as New York is partially appreciated when it is realized that the privilege granted to the fee owner to appropriate the community-created ground rent is, in places worth \$400,000 per foot front. It is clear that the provisions of our law which make it legal for fee owners to appropriate such enormous sums of money, which they do not earn, but which are created by the activities of the community, are unethical, unscientific and should be changed. One hundred years ago it was *legal* to hold slaves, but

most of us are convinced that it was never *right* to hold slaves. Our laws should be altered so as to make it impossible for individuals to appropriate the enormous amounts of community created ground rent, which it is now legal for them to do.

THE EFFECT ON UNEMPLOYMENT OF HAVING THE COMMUNITY COLLECT ITS OWN GROUND RENT

It might as well, at this point, to get clearly in mind that wealth-producing employment is simply the *application of labor to land or the products of land*. It is very clear that employment in raising wheat, or cotton, or cattle, or dairy products, is the direct application of labor to land. Employment in manufacturing of automobiles, ginning of cotton, or milling of flour consists in modifying the products of land into more useful forms. Employment on the railroads, and bus lines, express offices and post offices is increasing the value of these products of land by transporting them from one place to another.

Is it not clear that if *all land* was held out of use that all wealth producing employment would cease?

If all land was held out of use, there would be no employment in raising the food we eat, or mining the coal we burn, or in building and keeping up the roads we travel on, or in building and keeping up the houses we live in.

If all land was held out of use, life on this planet would cease.

It is clear then that if any land is held out of use, employment is to just that extent decreased. Our present land laws make it pay to buy land for speculative purposes and hold it out of use, or out of its best use, until it can be sold at a profit. The writer lives, during the summer, in Aurora, a suburb of Cleveland, and near his home are many thousands of acres which are held out of use in this way. In Arizona, where this is being written, I would say that fully half of the land within ten miles of Phoenix is held out of use until it can be sold.

Is it not clear that a large part of the load of bonds under which our municipalities are staggering, are bonds for paving, and sewers, and water lines in front of miles of vacant lots? These improvements were put in to help sell land.

If it had not been for land speculation such of these improvements as were not needed would not have been made and millions of dollars worth of bonds issued for improvements the community did not need and which may be defaulted would not be a burden on the tax payer today.

At the present time the actions of our governing authorities are based on the assumption that the use of *capital* makes employment and consequently the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is making huge loans, for the purpose of increasing employment. A moment's thought will make it apparent that *land* or its products are the only essentials to employment. The use of capital renders this employment more productive than it otherwise would be.

The pioneers who spread over our country from the Atlantic Coast to the Pacific during the century that ended about 1875 had no lack of employment, but they did almost entirely lack capital.

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO LAND VALUE IF THE COMMUNITY COLLECTED THE GROUND RENT CREATED BY ITS PRESENCE AND ACTIVITY?

Since land values are simply ground rent capitalized, it is clear that if the community collected its ground rent, the selling value of land would go practically to zero. If this occurred it would be unprofitable to hold land out of use. Consequently it would be thrown on the market and be bought at an extremely low cost. Such a change as this would entirely prevent land speculation but in no way interfere with the productive use of land. At the present time ground rent goes into the pocket of the individual. Under the proposed scheme the amount would be paid to the community in the shape of taxes. The use value of land would be the same in either case.

COMMUNITY HAS NO RIGHT TO TAKE INDIVIDUALLY CREATED WEALTH

If the above proposed scheme were adopted and the community took the ground rent created by its presence and activity for community expenses, it would be unnecessary to levy taxes on individually created wealth as it does at the present time. Last winter the writer lived in a house in the middle of an orange grove, in Phoenix, Arizona. You will all agree that he has no right to take the fruit from this orange grove without paying the owner for it. The community, however, takes the position that it has a right to take a considerable part of the product of this orange grove in the shape of taxes every year. If there are 50,000 people in Phoenix, and the taxes on this orange grove equal the value of 50,000 oranges, it is equivalent to saying that each individual has a right to take one orange from this grove without paying for it. Most of us are convinced that the government of Russia is doing an unjust thing in taking from the peasants of Russia such a large amount of the crops as they do. But is it not clear that our tax system does exactly the same thing, but possibly not to the same degree? To put it rather bluntly, our laws permit the fee holders to steal about twelve or thirteen billion dollars per year of ground rent created by the presence and activity of the community. Then the community steals from the individual an almost equal amount to pay the expenses of our federal, state and local governments. Is it not clear that we do not suffer from lack of land in this country to give everyone employment? What we suffer from is the fact that this unused land is held at such a high price that the ordinary person is unable to obtain any of it to use.

The number of jobs which would be created if twenty-five per cent of the unused land in the United States were put into use would largely relieve our present unemployment situation. If all of it was put to use there would be

more jobs than there are people to fill them and unemployment would be a thing of the past. Under a system in which there were more jobs than there were workers, wages would rise to a point where they practically equalled the value of the product, thereby obtaining a just distribution of wealth which must be obtained if our civilization is to last. The foolishness of our taxation laws is apparent when we realize that a man who builds a building, thereby furnishing employment for hundreds of people in its construction and for many people in its operation, is fined by the community in the shape of increased taxes. At the present time this tax item is great enough to very considerably decrease the number of buildings which would otherwise be erected. At the same time we allow a person to hold title to coal lands, for instance, for thirty or forty years until the owner can find somebody who will pay him his price for it, rather than levying taxes against this land so that it will have to be worked or sold to somebody who will work it. It is land that is being worked that makes employment, not the land which is being held unworked until the owner can get the price which suits him.

At present if a man starts a factory and gives employment to hundreds of people, he is fined in the shape of taxes on his *building*, taxes on his *machinery*, taxes on his *inventory*, and in those states that have sales taxes, in taxes on his *sales*.

Our tax laws would make one think that it was a crime to add to wealth of the community or to increase employment and that it was a *praiseworthy* thing to *decrease* employment by holding land out of use for speculative purposes.

We must realize that *land is provided* by the Creator and that all His children have an *equal right* to a *life use* of an *equal share*. We must realize that *wealth* is the product of an *individual* or of *groups* of *individuals* and that while the community does have the *power* to appropriate part of this wealth it has no *right* to do so.

We must realize that society can be healthy only if it *obeys* the moral law, "Thou Shalt Not Steal"—and that getting something for nothing is the *essence of stealing*. If society permits *land values* to arise by allowing fee owners to appropriate community-created ground rent, it must pay the penalty in *unemployment* and *low wages*, caused by holding *vast* areas of land out of use or out of its best use. If society discourages thrift and *individual initiative* and business activity by appropriating part of the value created by the individual in the shape of taxes on wealth, it must pay the penalty in the decreased employment and consequent lower wages resulting from lessened business activity. Until we act on the very obvious truth that what the community produces should be collected by and for the community and not by and for fee owners, and also recognize that what the individual produces is his and the community has no right to it, we shall be plagued with *unemployment* and *Communism*.

Very little change in our laws would be required to ob-

tain the results desired. We are already taking part of the community-created ground rent in the shape of taxes on land value; all that would be necessary would be to take the rest of the ground rent and abolish all taxation on wealth.

Ways and Means

ADDRESS OF ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE AT
HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS

MOST of our conferences during the past few years have been talk-fests, that undoubtedly warmed and inspired all of us who attended them, but did not send us forth with a definite concerted plan for work.

I hope certainly that this Congress is going to be a love feast, but I hope also that it is going to result in the most focussed effort that was ever achieved by a gathering of Single Taxers.

We must not go away from here regretful that we had wasted money that might better have been used on real propaganda.

The dollars we are spending in getting together at this place and time are hard earned and must be *well spent!*

For my own part I feel breathless with responsibility and the consciousness that tempus is fugiting. Unless we move quickly and really accomplish something that will count in world affairs, we will be too late; our opportunity will have been missed and our cause (snowed under stupid palliatives), will slip back into the limbo of lost causes, for sad, long years.

Times are desperate and it is vital that we, who have the key to the situation, pool our ideas; that we find, as I implored last year, the "greatest common demonination"—one central plan on which we can all agree—on which we can focus our endeavors.

This does not imply that we must not, in our several ways, work also to meet our special or local needs; it merely means that united we must stand.

We must organize.

Single Taxers must become known to Single Taxers—all over the map. Single Taxers en masse, must make themselves known as Single Taxers to the world at large.

It should of necessity be an organization that has one common purpose—one purpose for which we can all work.

Education is our greatest ally. We need more people who understand our philosophy.

Ignorance is our enemy. It has long been our boast that (unless he be a gainer through the special privilege that is the order of this present system) no one can be against us if he really understands our doctrine.

Therefore, our paramount effort should be directed toward widespread education in our philosophy.

We can certainly all stand together on that platform; no matter how we may disagree as to political interpre-

tation, we must certainly agree that the preaching of our philosophy, as taught in "Progress and Poverty," is our first great duty.

Therefore I pray we may form a fellowship that shall reach far and wide, across the borders of this land, across the oceans—and be the means of banding Single Taxers into a great army.

The work that has been, and is being done, by the Henry George School of Social Science is one of the most inspiring and deep reaching manifestations of progress in our cause for many a year.

This School, long the dream and then the realization of Oscar Geiger, is a monument dedicated to his life. He put his last strength into it and before he died started something that if it is continued, promises to carry us to victory.

Under his guidance the straight and unadulterated Georgian economics and philosophy were taught and students were graduated who are going out to carry on the fight, with practically the same keen mental grasp of the subject and almost the same spiritual fervor that those first disciples had, who learned directly from the lips of Henry George himself.

These new converts, who have acquired the Truth at the Henry George School, are the main financial supporters of the School.

It is a fact to give us all heart of grace.

One hundred and fifty are studying at the School now, of whom I am one—and we, who are trustees, are urging that extension branches be started all over the country under the tutelage of old, well-grounded Single Taxers.

It is a work that the faithful all over the land should back—not only with funds to enable it to carry on, but with cooperation of every possible kind.

While I harp on the absolute necessity of carrying on the Henry George School of Social Science, while I harp most fervently on the need for forming an organization that shall knit the Single Taxers together in one great focussed group, dedicated to clear propaganda—a group strong enough and dignified enough to lure back into the fighting ranks those thousands of Single Taxers who have been quiescent for years—I do not, in speaking to the point of Ways and Means—forget for one minute our duty to the great activities already so well established.

LAND AND FREEDOM should be steadily read by ten times as many as read it today and so should Mr. Beckwith's paper *Tax Facts*, and all our other periodicals. This Henry George Foundation should be better supported. All our avenues of propaganda must be retained. Somehow we must find means. When we do dig out the old Single Taxers who have believed our cause was a thing of the past, and when we do lead in the new Single Taxers who are being made through the Henry George School and through the extension courses, we will have a powerful group that should with new enthusiasm support our work.

But meanwhile we must, each in his way, fight more valiantly and more fervently than ever. We must not forget, in the rhythm of our glorious chorus, to continue with all the solo parts. Henry Ware Allen plugging along with those excellent letters that are sent to a group of powerful papers each week, and printed by many of them; the personal letters sent by Teresa Burger, that have been the means of bringing forth most helpful expressions from people in high places; the articles of Frank Wentworth; the street corner talks of George Lloyd and Morris Van Veen; the passing of pamphlets by Mr. Maguire;—the few words on our blessed subject spoken by you or me in trolley or taxi or on railroad train—we never know—some of these sparks may light the great Torch.

I personally am not afraid to use the word Single Tax. It is our trade mark. We cannot loose it—even though we try. The world is becoming used to the once-despised word Communism, and may have to become used to much more terrible words, before the end. Our name has lost its opprobrium and I believe we can fearlessly flaunt it and re-educate the world to its meaning. It is time now to show that the word Single Tax is synonymous with the words "law," "order," "peace," "justice."

There have been sad losses in our ranks since we meet in Conference a year ago.

Fred J. Bahni, whose workmanship many of you are carrying today in your buttonholes and who made for me this bracelet that I so proudly wear; Chester Platt, who used so regularly to attend our Conferences; Stoughton Cooley who bore the banner of his faith as long as he had the strength to lift it; Sir George Fowlds of New Zealand the most courageous of fighters; Oscar H. Geiger who gave his own savings as well as his very life to launch the Henry George School.

And I miss many, who through lack of funds cannot be here today, and three, who through illness cannot be here—Bolton Hall, Mr. Maguire and John Lawrence Monroe, but to those who are here I say—with Tennyson's Ulysses:

"Come, my friend,

Tis not too late to seek a newer world.

Push off, and sitting well in order smite

The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds

To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths

Of all the western stars, until I die.

It may be that the gulfs will wash us down;

It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles. . . ."

FIFTY years ago Henry George pointed out that the increasing number of mortgaged farms indicated that homeowners were being turned into tenants. Politicians and university economists pooh-poohed the idea. "A farm mortgage is an indication of progress and prosperity," they shouted. Well, who has turned out to be right?

Henry George School of Social Science

THINGS are happening. As we go to press, the capable director of the Henry George School of Social Science, Norman C. B. Fowles, reports so exceedingly an active and varied campaign for the new spring term starting February 4, that this story must be a rather sketchy summary of the details of this campaign. It is characteristic of the director that he is more concerned with the plans for the future than with any record of accomplishments. The fact that nearly one hundred and fifty boys, girls, men and women have during the past four months studied "Progress and Poverty" and "Protection or Free Trade" is not nearly as important as the details of the plan to double this number during the coming term, or the methods proposed for extending the work of the School outside its own portals.

On December 31, a mail circular offering the course in Fundamental Economics and Social Philosophy was mailed to twelve thousand New York City school teachers. Replies to this circular have to be followed up, sometimes two and three times. Letters were mailed to high school principals offering Free Scholarships to capable seniors in their schools. A similar offer was made to heads of the departments of philosophy, sociology, and economics at the local colleges and universities. Also, a number of social service organizations were circularized for the purpose of securing their secretaries as students. A committee of women, under the chairmanship of the ever-willing Mrs. Anna George de Mille, has been at work for over a month rounding up enrollments for afternoon classes, a most difficult time of the day to get people to go to school. The work of writing letters, preparing copy, answering inquiries, following up names of prospective students, interviews, is neither dramatic nor of apparent importance. Yet it is vitally necessary to achieve the goal, that of getting more and more enrollments.

One cannot possibly appreciate without seeing the amount of effort expended in getting people to attend these classes. It must be remembered that a course in the Georgist philosophy can be offered to the prospective student merely for its cultural value. He cannot hope to derive any material benefit from the acquisition of this knowledge, which is the usual motive for attending a school. The pure altruism of our philosophy, and the lack of selfish motive on the part of the School, makes the "selling" of the course most difficult. Mr. Fowles reports that the skepticism of some of the prospective students regarding the School's motives is a real obstacle in securing enrollments. Many of them cannot believe that back of our offer there is no nefarious scheme for separating them from their money. It takes real salesmanship to convince them that we have nothing to sell, save a plan for the betterment of the race.

The greatest result of the School work is the enthusiasm engendered in the students. Practically all of those who attended the fall term submitted names of friends for scholarships in the spring term. Many enrolled for Part II—which is devoted to a study of the "Science of Political Economy" and Professor Geiger's "Philosophy of Henry George"—and quite a few are taking Part I over again. At this writing the Student-Alumni Council is planning a dinner for graduates and present students, as well as for old-timers. The work of knitting together socially those who have acquired a knowledge of Henry George has not been overlooked.

The Extension Courses being organized throughout the country entails a considerable amount of thought and labor—which will be greatly increased as this work progresses. At this moment about forty copies of the "Teachers' Manual" have been ordered by Single Taxers who have signified their intention of starting classes. An account of John Lawrence Monroe's field work along these lines appears elsewhere in this issue. An elaborate system of co-ordinating these extension classes with the headquarters in New York is now being put in operation, so that the results of this wide-spread teaching will be properly recorded and ultimately brought to fruition. It is the hope of the Board of Trustees that Single Taxers everywhere will undertake this work of teaching classes in "Progress and Poverty" through the use of the "Teachers' Manual" so that the gospel may be spread faster and more thoroughly than has ever been done before. A thousand classes of at least ten students in each, should be the goal in 1935.

Every month the School conducts an open forum in the Pythian Temple. These forums have for their objective not only the spreading of our philosophy, but also the more definite one of attracting prospective students to the School. Lack of funds prevents the holding of more frequent forums, which would be much more desirable.

Mr. Fowles regrets that the Correspondence Course work has lagged. It is hoped that some day funds will be available to extend this department, which can be made a very valuable part of the School's endeavors. The cost of securing correspondence students, as well as the clerical labor entailed, have made it necessary to neglect the Correspondence Course for the moment in favor of the more productive class and extension courses.

During the first semester of our first year, fifty-three men and women spent sixteen weeks in the study of "Progress and Poverty" and of "Protection or Free Trade." Thirty-seven of these continued for another similar period in the further study of the philosophy.

During this first semester of the second year 180 were

enrolled in our "Progress and Poverty" course, and of these 143 have attended the weekly sessions in sufficient regularity to have gained a knowledge of our philosophy and the aims of the reform we propose. At this writing these students are engaged in a study of "Protection or Free Trade." None had had any previous contact with our philosophy.

Thus, we report an increase in this first semester of nearly two hundred per cent over the first semester of last year, and we have every reason to look for a corresponding increase in enrollment for the second semester, beginning next February 4.

Mention should be made here of the excellent volunteer services of Stephen Bell, Otto Dorn, and Will Lissner in teaching classes. The director will be called upon to enlist other valiant stalwarts in the movement this coming term, not only with classes in the School, but also in taking care of classes it is planned to form outside the School.

Things are happening, we repeat. The seed sown by the noble Oscar H. Geiger is bearing fruit. With the co-operation of Single Taxers everywhere the Henry George School of Social Science can become the means of making our philosophy known throughout the country.

IF Democratic congressmen and senators have any brains at all they know that the tariff should either be lowered or raised. Knowing this the duty is up to them to do the raising or lowering and not pass the buck to President Roosevelt. If their brains are less than the average amount they can show it by raising the tariff in spite of all experience and common sense. If no less than the average they can find by putting them to use that the tariff should be lowered. If above the average they can easily discover that the tariff should be abolished and will so decree. But if they have none the fact will be admitted by their surrender of power to the President.

AS chief of the N.R.A. General Johnson fixed Alabama coal miners' wages at \$4.60 a day. The operators threatened to close the mines and Johnson surrendered. Wages were made \$3.80. The operators control the land and those who control the land have more to say about wages than General Johnson. But land monopoly is still a sacred cow to the administration.

SATAN rebuking sin is never convincing however reprehensible the sin may be. So the old guard protectionist Republicans who find fault with the Roosevelt policies fail to be impressive.

SECRETARY of Agriculture Wallace finds that 50,000,000 acres of good farming land must be withdrawn from production if the present tariff is maintained. That is how the tariff "makes jobs."

Report of Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

DECEMBER—JANUARY, 1935

THE pamphlet, "100 Years of Land Gambling," a review of Homer Hoyt's book "One Hundred Years of Land Values in Chicago," by our president Mr. Hennessy, has been attracting attention. Some 13,000 copies were sent out during October and November. Among those who have written to the Foundation commending the pamphlet are: Hon. Dan Fellows Platt; Ida Tarbell; Norman Thomas; Father Coughlin; Housing Study Guild of New York; Walter Nesbit, Congressman; and those who have asked for large supplies for distribution include Mr. Swinney of Los Angeles; Mr. Paige of the Governmental Research Bureau, Chicago. Mr. Paige received 200 copies for the members of his Bureau; Dr. Gleason of St. Mary's College, Kansas; Steel & Co., brokers, Fort Worth, Texas. The Rev. Baska of St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kan., wrote as follows:

"I have read the article to my class in Economic History of the United States, for we have been recently studying the booms and speculations in lands during the last century of our history.

"My class consists of 57 students, and 14 of them hail from Chicago. They were extremely anxious to get a copy of this article hence I am writing in their behalf."

A supply was sent (we have had former pleasant contacts with this college), and further word was received from Dr. Baska of the interest of his students in this review.

There is, in the department of economics of the New York Public Library at 42nd Street, a section devoted entirely to material about Henry George. Through the donations of Mrs. de Mille, original manuscripts and precious scrap books containing a newspaper record of Henry George's remarkable career, are available for display. Many historically important and valuable documents are to be found in a glass-enclosed case. All books written by or about Henry George are on call. Rollin Sawyer compiled a catalogue around (1926) of about 90 pages, listing all the documents, and all books that contain mention of Henry George.

Through the courtesy of Mr. C. LeBaron Goeller, clippings concerning the administration and activities of the Fels Fund were turned over to the Foundation some time ago. Recently this file was given to the Library at 42nd Street, with the understanding that they would arrange it in scrap book form, and add it to the Henry George collection.

The Foundation has kept a scrap book record of all publicity on the subject of Henry George, the Single Tax, etc., since 1926. These news clippings and magazine articles occupy ten large scrap books. They have been

given to the Library collection, and thus there is now a permanent and unbroken news record of the progress of the Henry George movement from his own time to the present.

We have to acknowledge the receipt of two bound volumes of the Dutch paper *Justice and Liberty* sent to us by Mr. Kolthek who is now preparing a Dutch translation of "Progress and Poverty." He says: "The propaganda is going strong in our little country, and we are hopeful for the near future."

Mr. Joel Landres arranged to donate to the Henry Street Settlement a complete set of Henry George books. We mention this for the general information of New York Single Taxers.

Early in December Mr. Chandler held a Dinner of the New Jersey Single Tax League, which is described elsewhere in this number. He kindly invited the Foundation to prepare a literature table, as there were to be many strangers present. The writer arranged to have a table at the entrance of the hall, and displayed only a few of the many books that are on the Foundation booklist. But interest centered on these few—"Social Problems," "Significant Paragraphs," "Progress and Poverty," and "The Philosophy of Henry George,"—scarcely a book was left at the end of the evening, all of the copies having been sold, and orders received for additional copies.

May we take this opportunity to say that at every lecture, gathering, study class, or other semi-public meeting of Single Taxers, it would be an excellent plan to have a literature table. During the lecture only a few words need be said about the books, but if they are mentioned, and it is explained that a better grasp can be had of the real meaning and importance of Henry George, if his books are read, it will be found that the usefulness of the lecture itself has been increased.

In this connection, we are advised that Mr. George Briggs, Mr. R. E. Chadwick, Mr. H. H. Ferrell, Mr. L. J. Quinby, Mr. George Shaffer and Mr. David Woodhead will conduct a series of lectures on "The Philosophy of Henry George" at the First Unitarian Church, Los Angeles, Calif., beginning March 6. Arrangements as described above are being made. Incidentally this idea of Mr. Briggs' and his associates, of having a series of addresses, is an excellent one, and could be carried out by Georgists in many cities.

Among the many hundreds who have corresponded with the Foundation office during the past month, are Mr. Eckert, Mr. Preston, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Berkowitz, Mr. Recker, Mr. Marquardt and Mr. John Allen, all of whom have obtained books in considerable quantities, and have done personal "missionary work" in interesting their friends and business colleagues in "Progress and Poverty" or "Social Problems."

Through the kindness of Mr. John S. Codman, we

have 100 copies of his handsomely bound book "Unemployment and the Revenue Problem" on hand for distribution. A copy will be sent to anyone who desires it upon receipt of twelve cents in stamps to cover postage. Likewise, we have 600 copies of Mr. Ralston's book "What's Wrong With Taxation" (paper covers). This book is available at twenty-five cents per copy, postpaid.

While Mr. John L. Monroe visited this city, we had the pleasure of conferring with him upon his plans for extending the work of the Henry George School. Mr. Monroe plans to start "teachers" in the organization of classes in various cities throughout the country, the teachers to use the "Teachers Manual" issued by the Henry George School in New York.

While these plans were being made we were in touch with the following well known Single Taxers who had already organized extension classes: Mr. Hardinge, Mr. Tideman, Mr. Munch, (Minneapolis); Mr. Schwartz, same city; Mr. Alper, St. Louis; Mr. Sikes of Kansas; Mr. Dennett of New Hampshire; Messrs. Bove, Williams and Briton of Pittsburgh; Mr. Lincoln Crowell, Mass; Mr. Erwin Kauffman, St. Louis; Mr. J. Edward Jones, Oak Park, Ill.

The work that Mr. Bove is doing in Pittsburgh is particularly interesting. He has donated the use of a store for the Henry George literature, and for the activities of the Henry George Club of that city. Mr. Williams and Mayor McNair have undertaken the conduct of a class of 100 in "Progress and Poverty."

During December, a Christmas letter and circular was sent out to about 6,000 names, half of which were new names. About 300 books were sent out in response to this letter and hundreds of letters were written in answer to the orders and special questions that came in. Our records show that about 3,500 books have been distributed since May, 1934, and about 26,000 pamphlets (exclusive of advertising literature). Among the new books available are: "The Science of Political Economy," "The Story of My Dictatorship," and "The Condition of Labor." The former is \$1 the copy (new price); the other two are twenty-five cents each. All are being imported from England.

Of our own new editions Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown says:

"I am favorably impressed by the jacket notes and format. I am anxious that these books "Protection or Free Trade" and "The Land Question" shall do some good and in those cases where I already have a copy, expect to make the new ones available to others."

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN, Executive Secretary.

SCHOOL teachers were the first public employees whose salaries were cut as a result of the depression. Had they started twenty years ago to teach their classes sound economics there would have been no depression.

On the March With John Lawrence Monroe

FIELD DIRECTOR, HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL
OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

IF you wish the cooperation of Mr. Monroe in organizing extension classes of the Henry George School of Social Science in your city—

If you can arrange one or more speaking appointments for Mr. Monroe—

Write to the Henry George School of Social Science, 211 W. 79th Street, New York City (or to Mr. Monroe at 538 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago).

The following itinerary gives his schedule for February and March, beginning an extensive tour that will continue on through the Eastern and New England States during the better part of 1935.

FEBRUARY—MARCH ITINERARY

South Bend, Ind.	- - - -	February 1-3
Grand Rapids, Mich.	- - - -	February 4-10
Lansing Mich.	- - - -	February 11-17
Detroit, Mich.	- - - -	February 18-March 3
Toledo, Loraine, Sandusky, O.	- -	March 4-10
Cleveland, O.	- - - -	March 11-13

(All dates are inclusive)

* * *

HENRY GEORGE FELLOWSHIP DINNER

CHICAGO CHAPTER, JAN. 8, 1935

The first Chicago extension class of the Henry George School of Social Science had its last lesson on December 17. It is a tribute to the class instructor, Mr. Henry L. Tideman, secretary of the Single Tax League, that this was not its last meeting.

By the end of the sixth lesson, the question of "what to do about it?" was a pressing one. By the time of the last lesson the class decided that it would *do something*. The result was the organizing of the Chicago Chapter of the Henry George Fellowship and the holding of the first Fellowship dinner.

This dinner was the occasion of both a commencement exercise and an initiation programme. Certificates of membership in the Chicago Chapter of the Fellowship (national headquarters, 211 W. 79th Street, New York) were presented by Mr. Tideman to all the students who had completed the course of study in "Progress and Poverty"—twenty-two in all.

Nathan Hillman, youthful Chicago attorney, one of the graduates of the class, was chairman. John Lawrence Monroe presented some of the aims of the Henry George School of Social Science and of the Henry George Fellowship.

John Z. White, veteran 83-year old dean of the Single Tax movement, was the guest of honor and made one of the clearest and most forceful addresses of his long and honored career.

Mayor William N. McNair of Pittsburgh, whose hat was first thrown into the political ring twenty-five years ago at the suggestion of Mr. White, made a stirring appeal for outspoken defense of Henry George principles and for courageous action on their behalf.

Three members of the class, Mr. J. E. Trulove, Mr. C. O. Barden, and Luther Browning, were appointed to the Council of Chicago Chapter and each spoke briefly, pledging himself to support the principles of Henry George. As other extension classes come to a close and their members are enrolled in the Fellowship, three of each of their numbers will be appointed to the Council, thus creating an active body for bringing together the new leaders in the movement.

The roster of the Chicago Chapter of the Henry George Fellowship—all graduates of the class in "Progress and Poverty"—is:

Mr. C. O. Barden, Bert Beduhn, William Belmonte, Luther Browning, Irving J. Clague, Bernard Collins, James Farmer, Jr., Walter J. Groh, Nathan Hillman, James L. Holder, Richard Hubbard, Myron T. Monsen, Roger O. Neill, Mr. F. Newell, Gilbert O. Segerdahl, George L. Siemers, Dale E. Smith, Pierce Temple, Miss Dorothy Tideman, Earl E. Trott, Mr. J. E. Trulove, Maurice Welty.

The dinner was held at the Central Y. M. C. A.; forty-four attended.

MAYOR McNAIR'S CHICAGO VISIT

Mayor McNair of Pittsburgh spent a busy day in Chicago on Tuesday, Jan. 8. It was devoted to official business—Single Tax business. At noon he addressed the City Club telling them, as the *Daily News* said, "how it is that Pittsburghers have avoided tax fads and remained old fashioned and solvent." He described the Pittsburgh Plan of taxation and denounced such "fads" as the sales tax.

In the afternoon Mayor McNair met Mayor Kelly of Chicago. At 4:00 o'clock Mayor McNair and George M. Strachan had a 40-minute conversation on the Single Tax over WCFL, radio station of the Chicago Federation of Labor. Over forty letters were received in response from interested listeners.

In the evening the Mayor addressed the Henry George Fellowship dinner.

Mayor McNair plans to take a leave of absence for a month in the spring and devote it to speaking throughout the country. His tour may take him to the Pacific Coast to participate in the campaign for Judge Ralston's constitutional amendment.

DRIVEN off the land, destitute, in rags, thousands of sharecroppers and tenant farmers are face to face with starvation in the cotton belt. These sharecroppers and their families are scattered over nine States. They are the victims of the AAA acreage-reduction programme.—J. CLARK WALDRON in *Nation*.

Are Conventions Worth While?

THE value of conventions in the life of any association or movement, whether organized or unorganized is, it seems to me, so self-evident as to leave little, if any, ground for debate. But such conventions must be regarded as means to an end, not as an end in themselves. It would be very unfortunate if we were so to lose our sense of proportion as to look upon the annual Henry George Congress as representing any great achievement in and of itself. Such a Congress can be of value only in so far as it serves to educate its participants, to develop a greater degree of agreement and cooperation, inspire renewed zeal, bring about an improvement in methods or technique and expand activities which will advance the movement which it seeks to represent and express.

When the first Henry George Congress was held in Philadelphia in September, 1926, there was no definite intention on the part of its sponsors to make it an annual function, nor would we now insist that there should be any rigid adherence to any fixed procedure, either with regard to time, place or type of programme. But this initial Congress was welcomed so heartily by all participating that in response to the demand, it was deemed wise by the directors of the Henry George Foundation sponsoring the Congress to continue such gatherings as long as results achieved seemed to justify the effort or until a better plan might be devised for enlisting a greater degree of effective team work on the part of Single Taxers. In view of the sustained interest and of pressing invitations from Single Tax groups in various cities and towns, these national conventions or conferences have been maintained without a break for a period of nine years. Our hopes as to witnessing a great revival in the Single Tax movement have, I may frankly say, been realized only in a very small measure but we have nevertheless felt it our duty to persist in the effort, so that whatever has been gained might be conserved.

Personally, I welcome the freest discussion of this question on the part of all interested but I feel that the criticism recently expressed by my very good friend, the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM, is wrongly directed and rests, in part at least, on unsound premises. It is clear, of course, that no individual or organization has, or can have, any monopoly of the Single Tax movement. The doors are always wide open. Would it not therefore be well to direct our attention to the things that are left undone rather than to disparage what has been done? For we must all grant that much has been left undone and perplexing problems as to "how to put it over" remain unsolved after more than fifty years of experimentation and earnest striving.

The recent Henry George Congress held in Chicago was not only, in the opinion of many who attended, one of the best Single Tax conventions yet held but it was

probably the least expensive Single Tax convention of national scope ever held. All of the work incident to the planning and execution of the convention (which is considerable) was done by volunteer workers receiving no financial remuneration (and this includes a rather voluminous correspondence, not to mention much other work), the expense being limited to the cost of printing, postage and a few incidental expenses which were largely defrayed by five dollar contributions, voluntarily offered by those friends who felt that the modest investment was worth while.

As for the traveling expenses incurred by those attending, including hotel accommodations, meals, etc., which someone has estimated might aggregate as much as ten thousand dollars (but as to which no one can speak except the individuals who may have kept personal expense accounts), we may grant, of course, that there might have been a few persons in the assembly who, had they not attended, would have contributed the expenses of their trip directly to some form of Single Tax propaganda. But of how many is this likely true? Is it not more likely that by reason of attending the annual rally, many of these persons will actually increase the contribution that they would otherwise have made to their favorite type of Single Tax work for the current year. For it must be remembered that attendance at these annual gatherings is purely optional and that it has necessarily been largely limited to those who have time, money and inclination to travel, many of whom travel occasionally in any event for their own pleasure or self-improvement. As a matter of fact, many of those attending the conventions during the past two years were persons who had planned to visit the World's Fair and arranged their trip so that they could also get the benefits to be derived from fellowship with their fellow Georgists and from the exchange of ideas and information, if nothing more. Furthermore, with the exception of a small group of leaders, there are few who undertake to attend each year and for this reason the conventions are held in different sections from time to time and each convention represents in large part a new group, many of whom do not need to travel any great distance.

As one deeply interested in the cause of economic righteousness, I should like to see not merely an examination and appraisal of our annual convention, but a very earnest examination and appraisal of the Single Tax movement as a whole. If our movement is to thrive and grow and meet the challenge of the times in which we live, it should receive the best thought of our ablest minds, not merely for two or three days out of a year, but continuously, until a way is discovered by which the movement, founded by the great philosopher, may actually obtain some degree of momentum here in the United States.

Let us discuss and let us act in the light of the best

ideas we can obtain. Let us analyze our situation to discover what, if any, weaknesses stand in the way of progress. Among other things, the disciples of Henry George must learn how to organize. The national conference, or convention, was intended to be a step toward effective organization but the problem of organization in the Single Tax movement presents special difficulties not to be found in like nature in most other movements, if indeed in any other comparable movement, for Single Taxers are notoriously individualistic in promotional activities as well as in their social and economic philosophy.

In my judgment, really effective organization depends upon the formulation of something more appealing than mere academic education, important as that is in its own sphere. If the Single Tax movement is to attain great strength and achieve more rapid progress, it must, in my opinion, heed the advice of Henry George on the subject of "practical politics." The political and economic situation today is, of course, different in certain respects from that prevailing in the days when Henry George engaged in his political activities but the central idea, which he advanced as to ways and means is, if anything, more sound to day than it was then. The fact remains that until his followers can correlate their movement with some outstanding popular issue, the work of education as well as the work for legislation will probably continue to be confined to the restricted circles of the elect and thus fail to reach the masses. Until a solution is found, would it be wise to neglect the opportunity for suggestions and discussion and reports, which such an annual conference does afford, if nothing more?

Criticism of any particular type of convention programme is certainly in order and there is much room for improvement in this regard. This matter is entitled to earnest consideration, if we are to continue to have such annual or occasional gatherings, and I believe it was decided at Chicago to experiment the next time with a different type of convention procedure with a view to better results. But as to the specific criticism advanced in reporting the last Congress, it seems to me that there is something that might be said in reply. It is alleged that Single Taxers have at times been exposed to the painful experience of listening to certain speakers who are inclined to present a critical attitude. Now, if a convention is held for the sole purpose of obtaining newspaper publicity or impressing visitors with the thought that we are all like-minded in every respect, then perhaps addresses of a controversial or critical nature should be tabooed and we might well abandon any thought of introducing a variety of discussion. I believe that the convention programmes might be greatly improved by more careful planning and selection, but it is also my opinion that Single Taxers attending such meetings are benefitted, rather than harmed, by occasionally exposing themselves to a discussion of related questions from a slightly different viewpoint, rather than insisting upon

a rigid adherence to a restricted field of discussion. For example, whatever we may think of public ownership of public utilities as an immediate and separate issue, it is certainly a part of the programme advocated by Henry George and being a Henry George Congress, or such discussion in several years would hardly seem to be in the nature of undue emphasis. And touching upon proportional representation as another example, if we have any interest at all in methods of securing results in practical application, a discussion of effective political machinery for the attainment of our ends is certainly in order. Even the money question, which surely has had a very small place in any of the conferences, is not entirely foreign to the Georgist philosophy and programme and Single Taxers cannot afford to be ignorant of the subject when proposing to present the solution of our economic problem. And in working out concrete tax plans in a *transitional* stage, no matter how orthodox we may be, we shall probably have to tolerate some forms of taxation other than that on land values; hence it may even be profitable to give some consideration to the question of what kind of existing taxes might well be discarded first and in fact to anything having a bearing upon the development of a practical step-by-step programme, which could hope to win popular support in our day or in the present crisis. But in any event is it not true that fully ninety-five per cent of all convention time has been devoted strictly to discussion relating to the Single Tax in its various aspects?

Finding Single Taxers differing sharply in their opinions as to just what should be done and how those ends could be best attained, the Henry George Congress was conceived as a means of providing, if nothing more, an open forum of free speech where all of those interested in the philosophy and teachings of Henry George might meet as opportunity affords itself for earnest discussion and exchange of ideas in the faith that such free discussion would certainly tend to bring about better understanding and a greater degree of united action. I believe that the Henry George Congress has been fruitful in this respect, but I am eager to see much more accomplished in the years that lie immediately ahead. Certainly the time is now at hand when we might well subordinate discussion to action. Regardless of whether or not general agreement can be obtained in support of any particular concrete programme, it is earnestly to be hoped that those who have such programmes developed, will proceed to submit them to the test of practical experience and let the results speak for themselves.

P. R. WILLIAMS.

THE St. Lawrence Seaway is popular with officeseekers. Its building will encourage foreign trade, thus creating need of additional custom house officials to discourage this trade again.

Activities of the Manhattan Single Tax Club

THERE has been a notable increase in the number of visitors at the new quarters of the Club at 1165 Broadway, particularly by out-of-town Single Taxers.

The plan for placing the finances of the Club on a stable basis by securing pledges for definite monthly contributions is now assured of success, though the expansion of activities now under way will use advantageously the further financial support which, from present indications, is sure to be forthcoming in generous measure during the first six months of 1935.

Our Radio Broadcast Manager, Thomas Lane, claims that our President, Charles H. Ingersoll, will during 1935 far eclipse his pace for last year when he established an all-time world's record for radio propaganda publicity by emitting more than 600 broadcasts which carried his pungent economic sermonettes to many millions of hearers.

Provision has been made for the weekly printed publication and extensive circulation of these Radio Broadcasts which will be interspersed with interesting current economic items, all focusing on the Single Tax plan for industrial rehabilitation.

The Club is vigorously promoting a plan for inducing the Single Taxers of the metropolitan area to connect themselves with, and to aggressively enter into the work of the local organizations of the two major political parties.

The door of opportunity for work of this kind is wide open for all Single Taxers. Amidst all of the numerous fallacious schemes of the two parties for improving the deplorable conditions which are due to economic maladjustment, the simple and all sufficient formula of the Single Tax, if tactfully presented, is sure of an interested and respectful hearing.

Greater results at less expense can be achieved by Single Taxers in the arena where the actual, practical battles of politics are fought in the local political organizations and clubs and societies, than are possible by any other method. If all of the Single Taxers of the United States will eschew their metaphysical arguments among themselves and go vigorously to work in the great field provided for them by the two major political parties, they can make the Single Tax a live political issue within a year and can accomplish its adoption within a decade.

Pittsburgh should serve as an example and an inspiration for the Single Taxers of this country.

CHARLES S. PRIZER.

ADAM SMITH defined man as an animal that makes bargains—no other animal does that; no dog ever exchanges bones with another.

Limiting Production

THE proposals which apparently originated in the United States to limit the world production of wheat, and which were considered at the World Economic Conference in London, appear to us to be dangerous in the extreme. In the United States it was proposed to bonus farmers to reduce their acreage of wheat by a certain percentage. Whether or not it is intended that other countries shall adopt the same method of limiting production has not been made clear. A few of many objections we see to this scheme are as follows:

First of all, the statistics available as to world production and supplies are not reliable. The best that can be said for them is that at times they have proved to be reasonably accurate and that they furnish an indication of approximate production. Before the world-wide slump in the price of wheat, which set in during the fall of 1929, all manner of statistics were quoted to prove that the prevailing price of wheat was justified by world production and market conditions. It was because the Western wheat pools relied on this information that they lost millions of dollars and were almost put out of business. To attempt, therefore, to restrict world production on the basis of available statistics is risky in the extreme.

Supposing a country like the United States decides to reduce its total acreage by fifteen per cent. At the time such a decision is reached, conditions might seem to justify such action. But, suppose a crop failure was to follow. Instead of production being decreased fifteen per cent, it might under such conditions be decreased fifty per cent and the results be far from what was intended. How could such a contingency be prevented?

Sometimes what is considered to be over-production is really under-consumption. Today, there appears to be more wheat available than the demand justifies. But, supposing business conditions improve, as there are indications that they soon will, and hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of men now out of work return to employment. The present surplus of wheat would be likely to disappear as though by magic. In such an event, reduced production would mean nothing but loss both to producers and consumers alike.

It has been estimated that some 200,000 additional civil servants would be required in the United States to supervise the enforcement of restrictive enactments on several million farms. Tens of thousands of farmers hearing of the efforts to reduce production, might conclude that the price of wheat was likely to improve and each arrange to increase his acreage by small amounts. How is any government or organization, even with the assistance of 200,000 extra civil servants, going to check the production of tens of thousands of farmers scattered all over the continent? What assurance could farmers in Canada have that farmers in Russia would not increase their production were we to decrease ours? True, Russian Government might undertake to supervise production in that country, but its efforts in that direction so far have proved far from successful. It looks to us as though the less we mix up in undertakings of this kind, the better it will be for all concerned.—*Farm and Dairy*, Peterboro, Ontario.

A POOR tailor in need of work pressed a suit for 35 cents when the code price is 40 cents. For this he was sentenced to \$100 fine and thirty days in jail. No, this is not a tale taken from a history of mediaeval Europe. It happened in 1934 in Jersey City, U. S. A. Proceedings were under the N.R.A., the brain product of economic illiterates who have not advanced beyond mediaeval ideas. They believe a term in jail is the ultimate answer to all economic problems, probably figuring that if enough workers should be sent to jail pressure on those left outside would be relieved and the unemployment problem solved.

Pittsburgh

HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OPENS

THE Pittsburgh extension of the Henry George School of Social Science had an auspicious opening on Friday evening, January 4, with an enrollment of sixty students. The University of Pittsburgh has donated one of its classrooms in the downtown branch on the tenth floor of the Chamber of Commerce Building, where all facilities and conveniences are afforded.

Richard E. Howe, formerly of Chicago but now an active leader among the younger group of the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh, is Secretary of the School and the principal instructor, and as a volunteer teacher is giving a great deal of time and attention to the School with a view to making it one of the most successful in the country.

A keen interest is being displayed and another class is in process of formation, to be taught by George E. Evans, President of the Henry George Foundation. The officers of the Henry George Club and Henry George Foundation are actively cooperating as members of the committee in charge of the School.

The present course will run for a period of ten weeks and follows closely the official manual of the Henry George School of Social Science. "Progress and Poverty" is the text book and the classes are being offered free of all charge, except that students when registering pay \$1.00 for the text book. Sessions are held every Friday evening between 8:00 and 10:00 p. m.

* * *

PITTSBURGH ORGANIZING TO EXTEND GRADED TAX PLAN

An intensive campaign for the further application of land value taxation is under way in connection with the opening in January of the regular session of the Pennsylvania State Legislature and at a meeting held in Pittsburgh on January 3, a campaign committee was organized to sponsor and actively promote bills for the extension of the present graded tax plan in Pittsburgh and also for Allegheny County, with Chief City Assessor P. R. Williams acting as Chairman.

City Solicitor Ward Bonsall has prepared revised drafts of bills which will be promptly introduced when the legislature convenes following the inauguration of Governor George H. Earle on January 15. State Senator Bernard B. McGinnis and Representative John L. Powers of Pittsburgh are among those who are actively interested in promoting this legislation and in view of the fact that two similar bills passed the lower house by large majorities at the special session in December, 1933, the sponsors of the measures are optimistic as to the prospects of securing some important advance at this session, especially in view of the fact that the movement has the whole-hearted support of Mayor McNair's city adminis-

tration, as well as of large numbers of influential citizens.

Prior to the November election, most of the legislators from the City of Pittsburgh had pledged their support as candidates to the extension of the graded tax plan.

The new illustrated booklet, entitled "The McNair Five-to-One Tax Plan," of which John C. Rose, now Secretary of the Department of Assessors, is author, is being widely circulated.

* * *

Mayor McNair is constantly addressing groups of citizens in clubs, churches and civic and commercial organizations, and these addresses are largely devoted to the exposition of his economic principles, thus contributing greatly to the spread of popular knowledge with reference to more scientific methods of taxation.

The Mayor is also speaking this month in Chicago, Ill., and York, Pa., and may accept some invitations from the South in the near future.

JAPANESE statesmen claim that their country is overcrowded. And yet fifty per cent of Japanese farmers are tenants who support themselves and their families from the produce of their tiny two acre farms and give the landlords from fifty to sixty per cent of their produce in rent besides. In addition they support the statesmen who uphold landlordism. Such "overcrowding" should be relieved by getting rid of landlords and landlord-controlled statesmen.

THE law forbids one unable to pass an examination in medicine to make a business of practicing it. It does the same way with the law and some other professions. But however ignorant one may be of economic laws no statute laws prevents him or her from passing as a "professional economist" and teaching economic science—or what he in his ignorance may think to be economic science—in schools or universities. Some such are drawing big salaries for disservices of that kind. Worse than that such incompetents may be elected to legislative bodies or to the presidency where they deal with the economic situation and pass on measures relating to it. No wonder that the economic situation is a muddle.

A RACKETEER is a thickhead who has not learned that certain predatory privileges are reserved for land speculators only.

BOOK REVIEWS

NOTES FROM THE MOVEMENT IN DENMARK

En Verdenstankes Vækst I Vort Folk (Growth of a World-Idea in our Nation) by Signe Bjørner. Nyt Nordisk Forlag, Kobenhavn 1934.

In her recent book, entitled "Growth of a World-Idea in Our Nation" Signe Bjørner gives, in interesting animated form, the story of "Georgism," as the Danish Single Taxers call it, in Denmark. The book is not a history of the movement in the usual sense. It is a compilation, in more permanent form, of articles that have appeared

in *Grundskyld*, the Danish quarterly; of addresses given at the International Conference in Copenhagen in 1926, and at other important meetings. The material has been knit together in more or less chronological order, interspersed with notes on personalities, those who are still working for the cause, those who have passed on; with reminiscences of particularly important gatherings and lines of effort that have influenced political action. And through it all pulses the rich personality of the woman who is one of the leading figures of the movement in Denmark, and who yet belongs to our country as well, by her early life and family connections here.

Denmark's importance in the furtherance of the ideal of social justice preached by Henry George, cannot be overlooked. In this energetic modern-minded little country, the purest form of the doctrine is understood, and put into practical action, as nowhere else in Europe. There has never been, in Denmark, any stepping aside towards land-nationalization or communalization, as in England or Germany, for instance. The backbone of the Danish nation now is the free farmer on his own land, and just these "small-holders," as they are called, are the backbone of the Danish land-value taxation movement as well. A movement which they never forget is more than a mere fiscal policy. They understand it as the first and all-important step towards true liberty and justice for the people of any country.

As Mrs. Björner shows us, the Danish Single Tax movement has lived through three distinct periods of growth, separated by intervals of dormancy, due in one case to the World War, in the other, to the world economic depression. It is just now entering on the third period, and promise of new life is given by passage of laws that have written a certain measure of land value taxation into the Danish political edifice.

Touching lightly herself on the first period, Mrs. Björner has given the word there to an article by Dr. Villads Christensen, historian. Dr. Christensen was a sterling fighter for the cause, whose death in 1922, in his best maturity, was a great loss to the movement. His position as curator of the city's archives gave him authority which he used to high advantage in expounding the doctrines of Henry George. His article on the first period of the movement, given in full in Mrs. Björner's book, is a record of importance.

It is interesting to know that the Danish movement, based so largely as it is on that typical Danish class, the "small-holders," had its start and its early roots in another typically Danish institution, the so-called "People's High School," that admirable system of adult education for which Denmark is deservedly famed. Dr. Jacob Lange, still a tower of strength to the movement, gave the first impetus in an article of his in the organ of the People's High Schools. It will be remembered that it was Dr. Lange who first rendered Henry George's most important writings into Danish. Dr. Christensen gives a graphic description of the controversy called forth by Prof. Lange's writings and the first meetings that grew out of it. Even today, the Danish comrades hold their most important conferences and conventions in these High Schools for adult education, a most valuable and fertile field for propaganda. Out of these beginnings grew the first Henry George Club, in 1899. It was not a very husky infant and passed out gently two years later. But its successor, started in 1902, grew lustily and was able to endure although quiescent, even through the war years.

Then (Mrs. Björner herself takes up the tale) came the period of second blooming, culminating in the Parliamentary measures of land value taxation for State and Communal purposes. In this the Danish Georgists had the assistance of the Radical Left Party, of which many of the comrades were members. Their success in bringing about some measure of governmental achievement led to the holding of the Third International Conference for Land Value Taxation in Copenhagen.

Then came the period of world economic doldrums and, as everywhere, the work in Denmark languished. For even Denmark, with its interesting and valuable economic innovations, could not but feel

the grip of the universal calamity. And amid frantic governmental efforts to improve the situation came protectionist measures which discouraged and angered the Danish Single Taxers. But the tide seems turning now, and the various organizations are going ahead with renewed energy, finding a public once again ready to listen to some more fundamental remedy.

Mrs. Björner does not attempt to hide or palliate the disagreements among the Danish comrades, the same there as with us or anywhere where there is an alive and vital progress in the movement. In Denmark, as with us, the main discussions as to ways and means hinge on the two divergent paths of political action or educative work. The Danish League of Justice, a political party of Single Taxers, was formed against much opposition, even from the leading workers. But it accomplished its purpose of electing several members to the Parliament (four, at the moment), and does seem to have been useful. So much so, that even those who first protested are now helping. The work of education is going on actively. And as a number of the leading Danish comrades are principals or instructors in the group of People's High Schools, the study of fundamental economics and just taxation has become a part of the curriculum of many such establishments.

The charming personal note Mrs. Björner gives her book, introducing many of her fellow-workers to us, with photographs and the story of their labors, makes it delightful reading. Even in its easy informal manner, it is a document of lasting value. And it bears a message of encouragement to us all, in its story of what one little country has accomplished, and what it is still planning to do.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

A SPARKLING WORK

Sociocratic Escapades, by Francis Neilson, 12mo., clo., 319 pp. Price \$2. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London.

Who was it said political economy was a dull subject? He must have been blind to the screaming fun that is hidden away in what is taught as political economy. Is there anything really quite as funny as Malthus and the Malthusian theory, a curious caricature of the Creator at the hands of a preacher of Christianity? Or anything quite as subtly humorous as the Wage Fund theory in which it is assumed that labor, which produces all wealth and therefore its own wages, is dependent upon a mythical sum which nobody has ever seen set aside in some mysterious way to keep the workers employed. Due to its obvious absurdity this theory has not the strength it once had, though it bobs up every now and then.

Is there anything quite as amusingly ridiculous as the economic doctors at Washington busy with their fantastic devices. Some day a new Gilbert and Sullivan will embody them in some comic opera and the people of 1950 will laugh their heads off, but will say that of course it is grossly exaggerated. It seems unkind and perhaps a little disrespectful to picture the Chief Executive who gave away billions of other people's money as the Lord Bountiful of a spending campaign in which dollars are made to figure as pennies.

Man is an "amoozin' cuss," as Artemus Ward called him, and he is never quite as amusing as when he is reconstructing the economic edifice and piecing together the sorry patchwork of his substitute planning for the plan of nature. Marx, Tugwell, Richberg, Harry Hopkins, and the late General Johnson in his character of Coney Island barker for the administration—all are supremely amusing playboys amid the eternal verities they do not understand.

Because Francis Neilson is keenly alive to all this he has made a sparkling book. He sees all the funny spectacles provided and he just canters through them in a spirit of positive enjoyment in the havoc he is wreaking. He is having a good time and he shares it with his readers. If there is any stupid pretender who escapes his sharpened spear it is because he is too insignificant to be noted.

There are keen thrusts at Richberg, Lippman, Norman Thomas, all in surpassingly good humor. There is a whimsical defense of

gambling and gamblers which has much underlying truth. And his defense of the American business man who has been abused, lampooned and blackguarded is a spirited and admirable rebuke to the direct charges and covert insinuations emanating from Washington.

There are searching criticisms of the opinions of Justice Brandeis, Holmes and Cardozo, and in these Mr. Neilson shows how shaky and unfixed are the foundations of their democracy, how very questionable are their definitions and their attempts to arrive at conclusions which will leave our institutions invulnerable to attack. He does not spare them, and to Justice Cardozo, who says: "Men are saying today that property, like all social institutions, has a social function to fill," he applies the quick rejoinder: "Property is not a social institution. The mere fact of saying it is a social institution does not make it so."

The lance carried by Francis Neilson is not always pointed in sheer enjoyment of the mischief he is making for the real enemies of a true social order. He is not solely concerned in showing up the curious and often comical misconceptions. We would not have our readers think there is not a very serious undertone to this remarkable book. Francis Neilson is very much perturbed about the future of the nation and the world. He surveys conditions with a sorrow that informs what the reader may sense at times as levity. But beneath it all is a profound seriousness which the judicious reader will discern. We append a few extracts which will give a taste of what is in store for those who will procure the book, and read it from cover to cover, which we trust will be all who read this very inadequate review.

It is sad to think of the intelligentsia of the Sociocratic Party meeting in Chicago and never dreaming what they were in for. Little did they dream once Roosevelt had accepted the nomination that they were on their way to bury the Democratic Party in a non-sectarian cemetery, the only successful collectivist undertaking. Page 41.

Poor labor, your devoted leaders in the Unions and the Houses of Legislature throughout the land know little what bills are piling up all over the country that you will have to foot. One of your true friends told you years ago what would happen, but you were too pre-occupied with nominal wages and shorter hours to give thought to his warnings. He told you that poverty advanced with progress, and so it does. Page 37.

One can acquire a reputation nowadays as a rhetorician by making a speech in which nothing of importance has been said. We have had oceans of them ever since NRA set to work. Our great propagandists, in and out of government, must live in Mason jars. The air never gets at them. Page 78.

For clarity of statement and beauty of prose where will you find in our sociologists, social service people, and relief dispensers anything that can be compared with a work by Eddington, or Jeans, or Herrick, or Sir. William Bragg? These people write prose as poets do. When one turns to the New Dealers' works, the planners' books, and reads their sentences, crepitant Latinisms, and all the hocus pocus verbiage that covers up a host of literary deficiencies, he wonders how university faculties can persist in encouraging the departments through which these authors pass. Page 98.

One reason why our president is concerned about our natural resources is that at one time in this country there were opportunities given to our simple and primitive folk to build homes. But now "the frontier has disappeared." Of course it has. Government stood by and watched it disappear. Page 115.

The man who gave to mankind a set of principles which would lay a sure foundation on which to build a future from the injustices, antagonisms and distinction of class and race that afflict the world today was Henry George. But so far mankind in several countries of which I have had experience, shows little or no inclination to benefit from his work. Yet everybody seems to know something about Henry George. His name appears in editorials, presidents of universities refer to him, statesmen in various countries have caught millions of votes by using his name. At one time in England he was the most popular and unpopular man in this world. Page 120.

Here we see that the essential step in doing something for humanity is to remove injustice. And Henry George has shown simply and clearly what steps are to be taken to carry out this fundamental reform.

Is it a panacea? I do not know. Suppose the reform is carried

out; is there any hope that man will then be happy? I do not know. For happiness, it seems to me, is a question of personal concern quite as much as religion. But this I do know, that there is no other way of setting man on the road to happiness. There is no other way. Pages 124-5.

I knew some one connected with this administration would say, "Our new structure is a part and fulfillment of the old. All that we do seeks to fulfill the historic traditions of the American people." The little grocer who gave a loaf of bread with two quarts of milk he sold to a customer was convicted and fined. I presume that that was according to the historic traditions of the American people. Pages 140-1.

Mr. Roosevelt has my profound sympathy. It seems to me that he is rather new at the game. His speeches seem to indicate that much. He seems to be surrounded by a crowd of people who have the most extraordinary ideas about humankind. There is not one who has delivered a speech or written a book who seems to be conscious for a moment that the working classes are composed of human beings. They seem to picture them as a lot of surplused choir boys marching down the aisle to service. They never picture the choir boys with the surplices off, before or after the service. Page 173.

Perhaps Mr. Thomas (Norman Thomas) will have an opportunity some day of making a study of the question what is and what is not property. And when he starts about it, he will find that the law of property arises out of the law of social justice. Socialists from the beginning found the law of property the greatest obstacle in their way. So they determined that they would abrogate that law and at one fell swoop, a genius among them decided that there was no such thing as justice and, in abandoning justice, they abandoned economic fundamentals and ethics of which they are the basis. To what extraordinary shifts are men pushed when reason is thrown to the winds! Page 246.—J. D. M.

WELL MEANING—BUT?

Utopia Dawns, by John Pratt Whitman, 20 Union Park, Boston, Mass. 144 pp. Price \$2.

We do not like Utopias. Nothing has ever come of them and most of them have disappeared. They read well on paper but they break down in practice.

This is an interesting account of Utopias, those that have disappeared and those on paper, from Plato to Wells. It is curious to note how the makers of these manufactured Utopias propose to regiment the children, no doubt because they are more easily regimented than the "grown ups." Plato questioned the ability of parents to rear their children properly so he would turn them over to the state. Robert Owen in like manner would have done the same, beginning with children of one year of age. In the Utopia pictured by Andrae in 1691 children were to be submitted to like regimentation. It seems to have been a habit of all of them to consider that if men and women were not the pawns of the state children certainly were. Poor kids!

But these Utopians meant well and there is something catching in their enthusiasm. Mr. Whitman believes that the time is at hand for the adoption of Henry George's proposals and he has a rather interesting chapter on Henry George with a portrait of the great economist.—J. D. M.

AN IMPORTANT VOLUME

We have received from the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade the "Conference Papers" presented at the Fourth Annual Convention at Edinburgh, July and August, 1929. This volume bound in stiff paper covers contains the Declaration of Principles and Policy, the remarkable opening address by Hon. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, president of the International Union, and addresses on Land Value Taxation and Free Trade in Denmark by F. Folke and K. J. Kristensen, The Influence of Henry George in Denmark by Jacob E. Lange, and Spohus Berthelson, papers on the movement in Australia by E. J. Craigie and A. G. Huie, and one by Alan C. Thompson, treating of the movement in Canada. Others represented are John J. Murphy, Dr. Alex Paletta, Otto Cullinan, C. H. Nightingale, Carl Marfels, F. C. R. Douglass, Chester C. Platt

(now gone from us) Byron Holt, (also passed on) Pavlos Gianellia and a number of others.

A hitherto unpublished address by Henry George is the concluding paper. This interesting and valuable work of 250 pages can be had of the Treasurer of the International Union, Mr. Ashley Mitchell, 94 Petty France, London, S. W. I., England, for two shillings and six pence. It is exceedingly interesting and informing and is the most important contribution made to the history of the movement since the Single Tax Year Book was published from this office in 1917. Of course much that is contained in these "Conference Papers" is supplementary thereto, since they cover later years.

PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

We have received from the United Committee, 94 Petty France, London, S. W. I., England, a number of recently issued pamphlets as follows:

Unemployment and the Land, by W. R. Lester.

The Only Way Out of Unemployment, by Henry George Chancellor.

Russian Lessons, by A. W. Madsen.

Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, by Harry Crossley.

Cities Held to Ransom, by M.

Justice the Object, Taxation the Means, by Henry George.

The Beneficence of Natural Law in the Economic World, by Charles H. Smithson. (Recalling Oscar H. Geiger's remarkable address under the same title.)

These should be in the hands of all our friends. They are written with the thoroughness and clarity that characterize the work of our English friends. Every one of these pamphlets is worth while.

In addition to these there has arrived a new edition of "The Story of My Dictatorship," attractively garbed in stiff red paper cover and comprising 90 pages. It can be had for a shilling.

Correspondence

AS TO INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your review (Sept.-Oct. issue) of Green's book, "The Profits of the Earth," properly condemns his appeal to the teachings of Henry George in support of "the thesis that interest will not persist in a society where the full economic rent is appropriated by government." Even if he intended to refer only to George's fundamental teachings he was bound to make clear that George specifically endorsed it.

But are you dealing with the thesis itself as Single Tax progress practically demands in view of present resistance? We know that George did not go into the great reducing effect of Single Tax on present interest; by the eliminating from its support of diverted rent which is one-half,—and the *certain* part—of all present interest payments. That he simply contended that increased production due to capital would amply support interest notwithstanding such lost support; and that this morally belonged to capital.

But business men, and even consumers generally, know from common experience that the selling prices of all products—including cows and calves as well as planes and planks—are determined solely by the variable supply offered; so that both reproduction and tool values attaching to them are actually distributed generally, just as Single Tax would distribute generally the values attaching to land. Shall Single Taxers deny that calves and planks and cows and tools must and do sell on the common cost basis? And shall we stand regardless of this on the moral theory that capital (the product of expended labor) *gives out "stored labor" interminably*;—thus allying ourselves with the present Frankenstein monster which makes \$20,000 of capital the equivalent of a never-dying live worker? Or shall we stand simply on the sound ground that capital will get only what its possible scarcity may command, plus any shared profits (excess wages, etc.) of special enterprise?

Of course this interest matter is "immaterial," as George says, to the essential merits of his Single Tax remedy. But *the actual identifying* of Single Tax with continuance of the present certain-interest burden, *is killing its natural broad appeal*. And it is suicidal to retain such a position unless the vague contention that it "can be defended as a form of deferred wages" is backed by convincing proof that deferred wages are equitably entitled to or can get more *than the expended labor they represent*. Antagonizing the masses foolishly is a crime against our cause, swinging them from individual freedom to Socialism. Will not LAND AND FREEDOM help Single Tax progress by standing simply on the law of supply and demand for capital?

Is the fact recognized that Single Taxers who teach that interest is natural and will persist, logically endorse the Socialistic contention that Single Tax alone is futile—"not enough?" For what sort of an ideal would Single Tax satisfy if millions of workers (say one for each \$20,000 of capital) must interminably support thousands of mere owners of capital, who are just as useless as mere owners of land? Would Single Tax be enough?

Yet that is what capitalists and workers are told will be the Single Tax outcome. If false,—what fools we be? And we have only to open our eyes to obvious facts in the everyday competitive selling and buying of *all* labor products on the cost-of-production basis; and our minds to untrammelled common sense reasoning, in order to *know*. If mistaken as to this "immaterial" matter which nevertheless controls attitude towards the great land value cause, is allowed to kill its progress, we are responsible for the killing.

Reading, Pa.

WALTER G. STEWART.

SOME PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In view of the difference of opinion regarding the subject of interest among the followers of Henry George, and the contention of some (a minority) that he was wrong, it seems important that this matter should be gone into deeply, his position thoroughly examined, and if possible definite conclusions arrived at.

In this brief comment I cannot do more than outline a practical phase which may help to clear the situation.

George's position is stated in "Progress and Poverty," pages 173 to 203, inclusive, and should be carefully reread and particular attention paid to the chapter on "Spurious Capital." I emphasize this chapter because as soon as one eliminates all spurious capital much that confuses thought on interest is also eliminated and leaves only the products of labor as capital. In this way if a full and clear title is given to labor, to the product which labor produces, we might give thought to the idea that the producer should, in equity, be compensated if he foreswears enjoyment and grants temporary title, *viz., lends to another*. It is beside the point to contend that if every one received the full product of his labor there would be little borrowing and much to lend. The much to lend, and the lack of borrowers might reduce loans to zero and consequently no interest and no interest rate whatsoever. In all probability under just and equitable conditions this would prove to be the case, but the point to consider is, if borrowing takes place under any conditions, is interest as a principle just?

In "Progress and Poverty," page 187, in the last paragraph regarding interest, George concludes: "It is therefore just." If interest is just it ought to prove out now in practice without waiting for the millennium or any other future development. But it is most essential that we find out what George meant by interest which he upholds and not confuse it in any way with the return from capitalized privilege, or that basic privilege, land monopoly and its concomitant, over-capitalization. Nor should our thought be confounded with sentiment, *viz., whether it is permissible for one man to do no labor and another labor to pay him interest*. It should be considered as a

principle, whether in all ways it is just and equitable or the opposite.

Let us take the self-evident truth that all wealth is the product of labor applied to land and hold in abeyance "assisted by capital." Let us consider the return wages and rent and prove out if possible that interest is the just return of capital. Disregarding economic theory entirely, what is meant by interest in the ordinary processes of production and distribution? It is a payment additional to the amount of a loan. Note that it is interest we are considering, not the rate by which the amount is determined. A bird's-eye view of production and distribution, viz., business processes, may be obtained by examination of the main elements of a typical balance sheet. A balance sheet gives the condition of a corporation or other form of business at a given time and is the result of income account and supporting data over a previous period. On the debit side note fixed and current assets, on the credit side liabilities and balancing items. In the net current positions we have movables, such as cash, goods, etc. These are labor products (cash is equivalent) and constitute legitimate capital. In the fixed asset position we have a different picture, land and buildings and other immovables. The last two are labor products and therefore legitimate capital. Land is another thing entirely; labor did not create it nor has any one ever had the right to exclusive ownership. Land is the source of wealth and while it may be capitalized it is not capital. To the extent that economic rent is not taken in taxation it may be and is capitalized and it is this value that appears in the balance sheet. Conversely if all economic rent were taken in lieu of taxation, or, which amounts to the same thing, if all land (capitalized) value were taxed to the amount of the economic rent, that capitalized value would be approximately zero in the balance sheet. This is the "spurious capital" referred to and would any follower of Henry George consider interest on such as other than spurious?

On the other hand, consider labor products as appearing in the balance sheet. In the case of buildings would any one question this interest return? If so, would they question as expense payment on the use of the buildings if ownership were retained by the builders and used by the operators whose balance sheet we are considering? Or take the machinery produced by manufacturers of machinery who retain ownership, would any one question an expense account as in the use of the buildings? The net return on either is interest. It is compensation for loss of what is termed in law "enjoyment," viz., *use by the makers*. It is payment for use (in time) of labor products, legitimate capital, and it is therefore natural and just and if not paid must be charged to charity instead of equity.

C. H. KENDAL.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR

We want to add a few words to what Mr. Kendall has written. With much that is confused as interest-payments swept away, or clearly identified as rent, and with increase of lenders and decrease of borrowers—a condition resulting from more equitable distribution—it seems clear that the rate of interest—payments for the loans of capital—will decline.

But does this mean that interest itself will decline (interest being the result of added efficiency due to capital), or, as George contended, rise as wages rise? There is no real contradiction here, since, under more equitable distribution there will be a great increase in the number of owners of capital, with results that are easily predictable.

So whether George is right or his critics are right makes little difference. If interest goes to the owners of capital and everybody has capital, it would seem that the matter is bound to work out satisfactorily under the *natural laws of equity*.

If to go into business, or to make additions to existing businesses, men borrow capital, and by reasons of such loans prosper, equity demands a return to the lender. If the right to such a return is denied the transaction, as Mr. Kendal happily suggests, is one of charity.

What seems to worry many of those who question the justice of interest is its supposed perpetuity. Thus our friend Mr. Stewart

in a communication received subsequent to the letter which appears in these columns, writes: "I have just sold two Lehigh Valley R. R. bonds granting that for all time the owner will receive four and a half per cent interest." That this is pure interest we have to deny.

These two Lehigh Valley R. R. bonds are bearer receipts for capital lent by Mr. Stewart to the railroad. The Lehigh Valley R. R. uses that capital in transportation services (production). There is no perpetuity in the contract that can be carried out unless the railroad is allowed its land value capitalization in perpetuity, in which case it takes more than its present bond interest out of the public.

Conversely, should the land value be taken in taxation it destroys the capitalization set-ups by the railroad. Improvement values go back to the land within thirty years, and, like any other contract, this one depends upon the ability to perform.

Perpetuity on any loan simply does not exist. The explanation why it does not is the changing character of investment, the dissolutions that follow new set-ups in industry, the mutations of ownership, and the fact that capital wastes faster than the rate of interest.

Our aim is, and Henry George's remedy will secure it, work for all, production for all, capital for all. If interest then rises it will go to the owners of capital who will then be (with poverty abolished) all the people. If it declines it makes no difference either, for it will have been absorbed as wages.—EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM.

CUT TAXES AND REDUCE CARRYING CHARGES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Kindly allow me space in LAND AND FREEDOM to comment on Milo Perkins' article: "Grab the Torch—Men of Means—Grab the Torch," in *The Nation* for November 28. It is truly a call for action that Chambers of Commerce should heed; a distinct contribution toward the solution of our maladjustments. But his suggestions concerning a higher wage might, I believe, be somewhat modified by a more careful study of the limitations of price "fixing," of any kind. Wages, and the price of all commodities will seek and find their proper level, if and when statutory and other obstacles are removed. Taxation is the chief obstacle.

Recall the sensation created by Henry Ford when he first raised wages to a minimum of \$5.00 per day. It attracted the attention of many economists and sociologists. The great scientist, Dr. David Starr Jordan, made a special trip to Detroit to study the innovation and evaluate its potentialities. Mr. Ford accorded the Doctor every assistance needed to make a survey, and when it was completed he was horrified to learn that his gesture had actually lowered his employees' wages 43 cents per day. He asked Dr. Jordan why that was so and was told that the dealers in living necessities, and landlords in Detroit had raised prices and rent to absorb the rise in wages; that the law of "supply and demand" governed, and might not be ignored with impunity. High wages will buy no more goods and services at high prices than low wages will buy at low prices. The Doctor advised Mr. Ford that if he wanted to help his wage earners, he and they must get control of supplies and housing and reduce prices therefore. That is what they did, but it should have been done first. By neglecting to set the stage in the right way before the act, he hurt his own employees, and all consumer-workers in Detroit. He had not thought the proposition clear through before acting.

Raising wages arbitrarily, or "pegging" prices for anything does not work. It is reversing the natural order and will always do harm, as it has in the past, whenever tried. First, attack cost and squeeze out every cent of overhead that is possible. Some cost items should be eliminated entirely. Taxes are one. All adjustments made, in cost of production and distribution, are reflected in prices and wages. Take all taxes out of prices; and wages *must* rise. Herein is the law.

If carrying charges were cut fifty per cent, the present wage could buy twice as many miles of transportation; and the price of all consumers' goods would drop twenty-five to fifty per cent. Ask dealers in lumber and coal, flour and other heavy freight. The buying power

of wages, salaries and farmers' products, would rise accordingly. That is the right way to raise wages. Congress can make that adjustment in the first few days of the next session, by underwriting *all* tax levies against *all* of our carrier facilities, in exchange for a substantial cut in rates, approximately fifty per cent. That measure of relief *must* be financed by a Federal levy of one per cent on *all* land values, urban and rural, irrespective of *all* improvements. Such a tax cannot be passed on to consumers, neatly wrapped up in prices, as are all other taxes except inheritance tax. It would reduce the price of land, thus making possible new housing and slum clearance without aid or benefit of HOLC or PWA. It would also enable tenant farmers to buy back their farms. Some at least.

That step would remove two of the major obstacles to recovery: Exorbitant freight rates, and profiteering in land. It would allow the natural laws of "competition" and "supply and demand" to act freely and work wonders. Natural laws are potent and usually assert their supremacy, even above acts of Congress. Ask your readers to get busy writing their Senators and Congressmen, urging a shift of *all* taxes now levied on carrier facilities to *land values* in exchange for a fifty per cent cut in rates. This action by Congress should be early next session.

Aberdeen, S. D.

CHARLES J. LAVERY, M. D.

DIFFERS WITH THE EDITOR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

1. Is it really necessary to kill the Henry George Congress in order to advance other methods of propaganda?

2. Is not the field large enough and the workers few enough to permit every man to choose his own methods?

3. If your estimate of ten thousand dollars spent on the recent Congress is correct does not that prove a demand exists for the Annual Congresses?

4. If they were discontinued, do you think ten per cent of that would be used to buy scholarships?

5. Your suggestion of nation-wide local meetings on Labor Day is good but why should that depend on killing the Congress?

6. Knowing Single Taxers as you do from over half a century of intimate and unselfish work with them do you think anyone can force them to abandon their own plans and ideas to adopt yours?

7. Remembering how disorganized the movement was when the first of these Congresses was held are we not deeply indebted to Messrs. Evans, Williams and their associates for starting and continuing them?

8. Would not the work of John Lawrence Monroe and of all other workers suffer if the Congresses were discontinued?

Bolar, Va.

WILL ATKINSON.

REPLY

To paragraph 1, the answer is no, but it seems to us imperative that we consider a somewhat different programme for these Congresses.

To paragraph 2, the question is not one of individual work, nor that of permitting every man to choose his own methods. For the Congress is cooperative work in which all should join, and this has been the aim of Secretary Williams from the beginning.

To paragraph 3, we do not think that the money spent proves anything. The Congresses may be worth while but money spent in traveling expenses does not prove it.

To paragraph 4, we can only say that we do not know.

To paragraph 5, we would say perhaps not, and to paragraph 6, we really do not know. But to paragraph 8, we think not.

To paragraph 7, we would reply that we are deeply indebted to Messrs. Williams and Evans for their splendid and devoted service in calling together these often fine and representative Congresses. But we do not recall that the movement was disorganized before

the Henry George Foundation was started, nor that we have now an entirely complete and satisfactory organization.

But this is all beside the point. There is no criticism to be made of those in control of the Henry George Foundation. Our statement was a plea for a vote to consider what might be done to improve the character of these Congresses by the elimination of much that does not belong there, and to perfect existing organization.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

WE MUST BE PRACTICAL

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

All science is but natural law.

Economics is a science, a natural law.

The Single Tax is a practical application of economics.

Our autos are made scientifically. We were practical in making good roads for their use and rules for safety.

What is the most practical way to put the Single Tax in operation?

Judge Ralston is practical in bringing economics in discussion by a tax amendment in California. He is showing that State the way. The importance and the practicability of the amendment is that it makes it possible for many to see what we are trying to show them.

St. Louis, Mo.

E. H. BOECK.

THE "PUBLIC'S" TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS MAGUIRE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Permit me to quote the following editorial entitled "Faithful Over A Few Things," which appeared in *The Public* for Jan. 14, 1916, concerning the late Francis W. Maguire:

"Early in the Single Tax movement a man joined the Chicago Single Tax Club for the purpose of aiding a cause dear to his heart. He could not make speeches, nor carry on a public debate, and he had little money to contribute. The first thing he found to do was to stand at the door, and hand out tracts to those who attended the meetings. Presently he added a few pamphlets—which he sold at cost. Then more pamphlets, and paper covered books were added, and finally a few bound books. All related to the Single Tax, and all were sold at the lowest price that would sustain his venture—without pay for himself. And so this earnest man coined his heart's enthusiasm into service for his fellows by distributing literature. Week after week he has stood behind his little stock of books, tracts, and pamphlets. If the stranger could not buy a book, a pamphlet was suggested. That failing, a tract was pressed upon him. Years have passed, the man's hair has turned white, yet still he attends every meeting of the Club, eager to supply the stranger with food for his soul, and setting high the standard of service for the many earnest working men and women in the Club. It will undoubtedly please the many people who have noted this fidelity to know that the commercial house in which he has labored in a humble capacity has recognized his faithful service by giving him a life pension. The Chicago Single Tax Club has had many zealous officers and members who have given of their time and their money; but no one has exceeded the devotion of F. W. Maguire."

What was said then could be increasingly applied as the years went on. Perhaps, it may be sufficient merely to state that on the day before he passed away, Maguire discussed with me plans to distribute more literature. In other words, he was faithful to the end, and to quote one of his favorite quotations, "with a faith that never faltered."

Pittsburgh, Pa.

JOHN C. ROSE.

CATCHING UP WITH HENRY GEORGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Of course you have not failed to note the report of the National Survey of Potential Product Capacity. It appears in the first

column of the front page in the *Herald-Tribune*, and I suppose is similarly featured in the other papers.

After all these years, they are beginning to catch up with the *starting-point* of Henry George so many years ago. What a heaven-sent opportunity to drive the lesson home, and to call attention to the fact that the "discovery" of the committee is simply that which "Progress and Poverty" pointed out with unerring clarity. The only difference is that Henry George was not content to verify the fact, but also analyzed the cause, and pointed out the remedy. Must it take another fifty odd years before those who have just arrived at his starting-point will learn also to follow out the problem to its only answer?

Paterson, N. J.

JAMES F. MORTON.

ENDORSES OUR PROPOSAL FOR A HENRY GEORGE DAY EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In my humble judgment, whatever that may be worth, the suggestion of a Henry George Day as proposed by LAND AND FREEDOM, is a most excellent one. I believe the observance of such a day by as large number as possible of local organizations, even with modest functions at first, would contribute most substantially to putting the Single Tax movement forward, and that of course is the prime desideratum with us.

The Annual Henry George Conferences are delightful and edifying to those who can attend, as they are to a much less extent to those who must be content to read about them. I am, however, quite inclined to feel as indeed I have felt for some while that they are a luxury which the movement can scarcely afford, as yet.

As I have said before, I am always reminded that at such gatherings, those in attendance enjoy a degree of sentimental satisfaction and mutual pleasure, and they extract considerable that is stimulating and helpful, but we go on milling around, holding aloft our nice, spotless banner, only no one outside those immediately concerned or participating cares a whoop about it. No impressive steps, no real stages of progress are marked. No one pays any particular attention. Not even publicity of any consequence is obtained.

With Henry George Day, luncheons, banquets or local annual gatherings, literally millions of people would at least hear something of the movement, for local newspapers are not so chary of space about reform activities which would provide publicity throughout the entire country. There would result, I believe, renewed and increased zeal and activity, and thousands would become interested. Educational opportunities would develop and out of all this certainly much good would result.

It appears to me that Labor Day would not be a desirable date to be celebrated as Henry George Day, though I admit the closely allied interest. One would detract from the other, resulting in no net gain perhaps for either. I believe Mr. George's birthday would be infinitely better. Mr. George stood for men, neither unionists nor non-unionists, neither rich nor poor, but for men and the fundamental rights for men. This is merely my thought on the matter, I do believe that such a combination would be unfortunate, that the psychology of it would be unfavorable and there would be a good deal of misinterpreting of it.

The observance of a Henry George Day, as you have proposed, would I think be a very great aid to the cause of the true economic philosophy.

Seattle, Wash.

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY.

A WORLD CONVERTED

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I agree with Frank Stephens when he expresses regret that so many in the Single Tax movement have not a knowledge of the fundamentals of our common belief. But I think also that many misjudge the relative importance of the ideas that Henry George gave to the world.

The greatest discovery set forth in "Progress and Poverty," in my opinion, is not the Single Tax but what I call The Gospel of Plenty.

George wrote at a time, as the book clearly shows, when all the world believed that poverty, even death by starvation, was the inevitable fate of many in a progressive society. The reason was very simple—the alleged rapidity of increase of population in comparison with the increase in the means of subsistence. With such belief widely accepted, it would have been foolish to prove that the Single Tax would distribute wealth more evenly, for that would only mean a diminishing ratio for everyone. Had this been George's belief he would never have written at all.

But he saw that in a progressive society plenty was not only possible but inevitable. In fact he saw that the means of wealth production in his own time had actually produced a condition of plenty. What he had to do was to destroy the false and horrible doctrines of that day and demonstrate the true science of political economy.

His very first word is a declaration of the existence of plenty—see the opening sentence and the rest of the first chapter of "Progress and Poverty." He not only declared this doctrine—which was not wholly new—but he proceeded to prove it. This he accomplished so effectively that no scientist with a reputation to lose has, since that time, squarely declared his belief in the old Malthusian doctrine.

But the world generally, including many Single Taxers, misses the second great invention of this master mind—that the product of labor is the wages of the laborer. This wholly upsets a doctrine which, in some form prevails everywhere today—that wages and subsistence of the laborer are paid out of capital.

Then came the third discovery—the Single Tax, which is a simple and practical means to assure to the laborer access to materials and practically guarantees him power to keep his product as his wages.

Many of George's followers accept the idea of plenty as axiomatic, or, rather, as trite. They fail to see it in its proper relation as the bedrock foundation of George's system. Thus, they misunderstand, or perhaps ignore, the second discovery, the law of wages. They therefore arrive at the Single Tax which they use only as a working tool of propaganda. Their ignorance of the science innate in the tool prevents them from using it to advantage.

Here we have a whole world of people who accept—whether understandingly or not—the basic doctrine of Henry George, the doctrine that in a progressive society there is plenty for all. But there is no one to show them that this plenty for all is only the first step toward truth. The second step is that everyone must have a job, which is nothing but freedom to apply labor to materials, and the right to take the product as wages. Then—third and final step—access to materials and right of absolute property in product is assured by the Single Tax. There is an added step in practice and necessarily covered by the above theory—that laborers of all kinds must be free to exchange what they produce. This is the way to translate plenty for all into plenty for each.

All this seems to me so plain, so vital, that I give all my time to making it known. I believe that to preach the Single Tax is to begin at the wrong end. For one thing, we lose the advantage which we have every right to claim—the rights of discovery in the great new fact of plenty. Instead of regretting so much the scarcity of our numbers as Single Taxers, let us declare our world conquest as preachers of our Prophet's faith in overflowing and assured abundance! Let us make it known to all the world that the same principle of justice the operation of which has produced this miracle of abundance, if trusted, will distribute abundance to every human creature.

Ottawa, Canada.

A. C. CAMPBELL.

HENRY FORD AND HENRY GEORGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I have just finished reading "Henry George and Henry Ford" by Charles O'Connor Hennessy.

I have noticed this resemblance mentioned in the article before. The first time was when I was reading an article by Ford in the *Liberty* magazine a few months ago. I no longer have the copy and can not remember the exact words, but one of the sentences was to the effect that in the future we may devise a tax system that will eliminate depressions and solve our unemployment problem.

The sentence came as a surprise to me, but since I have reviewed Ford's ideas I see that they do not conflict in any particular that I can find with George's.

Georgetown, Ill.

ALVIN TESTOR.

THE CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN

EDITOR AND LAND AND FREEDOM:

I write this note so that the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM may be brought up to date on the California situation.

It will be recalled that a sufficient number of signatures were procured to secure the presentation under the initiative to the voters of California of a constitutional amendment which would cancel recent sales taxes, prohibit their future imposition, and transfer within a period of five years all taxation upon improvements and tangible personal property to land values. This amendment may be brought before the people of California at a special election which the Governor of California may direct to be called, or in default of such direction, must be presented to them at the general election in 1936.

The present unsettled question is, at which election the amendment will be voted upon. If Upton Sinclair had been elected governor, there would have been little doubt that the amendment would have come before the people probably in June or July of the present year. Merriam, however, was elected. His general attitude has been hostile to the amendment, and it seems now fair to believe that he will not order it to a special election but that the contest will be deferred until November, 1936. The delay is not in all respects unfortunate. We have an extended opportunity in which to carry on the discussion and familiarize the people of the State with our ideas. In addition, certain immediately pressing questions as to the present State deficit will be cleared up and the issue simplified. From all this we shall expect in the end to be the gainers.

Meanwhile, we are gratified to note that one reason why our statesmen at the capitol at Sacramento entertain manifestly a wholesome fear of what the result will be when the amendment comes up to be voted upon by the people. They are therefore disposed to postpone as far as possible what to them seems to be the evil day.

I cannot refrain from once more calling the attention of all sympathizers in the country to the fact that this election will be the most important one, as well as the most promising, so far in the whole history of our movement, and to urge upon them that they do everything in their power to further its success. Their influence in the work they may be able to do in California, although they are beyond its jurisdiction, can be made to start effectively upon the final result.

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

ABOUT BEING SAVED

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The comments on the Henry George Congress by the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM meet with my enthusiastic approval. I attended the previous Chicago Congress and at about the close of the meeting, stated from the floor that I had no interest in attending meetings whose members devoted most of their time to reading Single Tax papers to each other, and to the discussion of Old Age Pensions, Unemployment Insurance, Money and other social questions, important as they may be.

In my opinion there is only one reason for a Henry George organization and that is to make practical plans to promote his idea until it becomes a realized social fact.

Single Taxers are not as dumb as Mr. Frank Stephens would have

us believe, and it appears to me that lack of progress is due to the fact that so many of us are really following the suggestions of Mr. Stephens and debating with anyone on any subject. It is difficult to become a Single Taxer without doing a little thinking and like those who acquire wealth quickly we just automatically know everything.

We should of course, try to keep reasonably informed on all public questions, but having made up our minds to what we want it is suicidal to let anything divert us. But Single Taxers chase every social rainbow, municipal and state ownership, proportional representation, money, old age pensions, unemployment insurance and what have you—all good—all desirable. Did you, however, follow the courses of the women who wanted to vote and the prohibitionists who wanted a dry earth? Did you know any of them debating birth control or the Einstein theory with all comers? You did not. These groups knew what they wanted and as they say in golf, they swung on the ball and "followed through."

After one becomes a Single Taxer, there are just two questions:

1. How to get Single Tax?
after which

2. How to apply Single Tax?

The country is full of individuals and little groups scattering little seeds from hell to Wisconsin and back again and collectively have they raised a garden? They have not; not even a hill of beans. Gardens are not raised that way. When it is desired to raise a garden, a spot is prepared, seeds are planted and that spot is weeded and cultivated.

I believe it possible for us to really make a successful garden if the Single Taxers of the country will select some State, any State, as the "spot" and then give that spot everything WE'VE got in money, energy and thought. It might take ten or fifteen years or more to really produce results, but what of that? Isn't it better to look forward to possible success in twenty years rather than to wander along for another fifty years and get nowhere?

In connection with how to apply Single Tax, it's simply impossible to understand Mr. Stephens, as this question was answered hundreds of years ago. I don't know when, and it's answered thousands of times every day; it's answered every time a landlord and tenant agree on a lease. Everytime a ninety-nine year lease is made for a new office building, the tenant agrees to pay the specified annual rent for the use of the particular "site" to be used, and the abolition of taxes and the collection of land value rentals by society is as simple as that.

There really isn't very much excuse for an old timer in Single Tax to answer the question "How shall we assess the rental value of land where collection of economic rent has ended selling values?" by saying, "Let us be elected first and we'll find out what to do about it afterwards."

The questioner answers his own question if he would but consider this part of it "when collection of economic rent has ended selling values."

When the State has collected economic rent that has ended selling values, that is Single Tax, and why ask any question concerning how to do something already done. It is surprising that a practically minded S. T. like Mr. Stephens should be thus caught in a maze of his own making.

What we need is what the women Suffragists needed, voters. The way to get Single Tax voters is to teach people about Single Tax. They can understand Single Tax and they can't understand these other things which apparently no one understands, and they don't care anything about them anyway.

People can understand "A steady job and increased purchasing power." That's our gospel and our text; let's stick to it. You may have all the intellectuals who can discuss money intelligently and disagree about it, but as for me, I should like to help cultivate a "spot" where a Single Tax garden will be the desired end. Let's abandon our narrow, localized ideas and agree on a "spot." I'd

work as hard and do as much for California, New Jersey or Delaware as for Michigan if we were all agreed, but the idea of filling a gun with bird shot and shooting straight up in the air never did appeal to me. Some day this kind of shooting might get a bird, but?

Detroit, Mich.

A. LAWRENCE SMITH.

SAVING THE LANDED INTERESTS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It is interesting to note that so many young men who are active in the "New Deal" so-called, are large holders of valuable real estate—Vincent Astor, A. Averill Harriman, William H. Vanderbilt, Henry Morgenthau, Sr. and Jr., Lew Douglas, etc., etc.

Here as in England, the landed interests are willing to try almost any new experiment even though it uses up half of their income so long as it does not in any way endanger the security of large land holders. Perhaps this is not done consciously; but sub-consciously or unconsciously these men are certainly looking for their own interest. Even the men upon whom it would seem we ought to rely are wandering off after strange gods.

The Single Tax is the most radical and at the same time the most conservative of all reforms. It is in line with American thought and traditions; leaves rugged individualism a permanent factor in American civilization as it has been in the past; believes in and advocates individual initiative and the right of the individual to keep his own earnings and to transfer them to his children; and at the same time it will accomplish everything that the New Deal is trying to accomplish without all this complicated mix-up and hubbub which has put the average business man in a position where he does not dare to make a move for fear it may be the wrong one.

I was extremely sorry to hear of the death of Oscar Geiger. Our movement has been fortunate in attracting men who have been willing to sacrifice themselves for the cause.

Fort Atkinson, Wisc.

CHAS. B. ROGERS.

ALL SINGLE TAXERS WILL NOT AGREE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It was only after I had read Mr. Luxton's comments that I gave serious consideration to the article by Mr. Stephens in the Nov.-Dec. number of LAND AND FREEDOM.

I. Mr. Stephens quotes Socrates, "The beginning of wisdom is the definition of terms," and regrets that no one of five well-known Single Taxers could define Wealth, Money, Interest, Utility, Value in terms that the majority would accept. Mr. Luxton's comment is, "When one considers that man is a biological entity the fact that not one of five prominent Single Taxers could agree upon certain definitions is not to be wondered at. Mr. Stephens expects too much of the human race."

In the same paper, however, Mr. Luxton complains of communists and socialists on the ground that they "change the meanings of terms many times in a single discussion" and asks, "How on earth can one convince such folk?" Moreover in Mr. Luxton's argument on money and interest I find little of anything more than an insistence on the definition of the terms. He concludes with another reference to communists and socialists, "We should not permit them to stray from the field when discussing these topics." How stray from the field? I ask. The answer comes in Mr. Luxton's own words. They "change the meaning of terms many times in a single discussion?"

I find myself in hearty agreement with Mr. Stephens as to the need for accuracy in the definition of such terms as he gave. Personally I shall hold myself more strictly to account than I shall those with whom I disagree. Accuracy of definition is fully as important for thinking as it is for arguing.

II. I find myself also in sympathy with Mr. Stephens in his feeling that if President Roosevelt had Single Taxers in his brain trust

they would find great difficulty in advising him. But immediately I have to part company with him, for if they did not pass out of the picture almost immediately, I believe they would find themselves in the category to which Mr. Stephens assigns Champ Clark, William J. Bryan, Ramsey McDonald, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, and Newton Baker. In passing I must be pardoned for saying that I do not like the tone of voice in which I picture Mr. Stephens assigns these gentlemen to their class.

III. I am greatly surprised, however, at the assumption that land will have no selling value under the pure Single Tax. Mr. Stephens makes the assumption and Mr. Luxton says that all Single Taxers are agreed as to that. I am not in agreement, and I claim to be a Single Taxer.

In support of my position I quote from "Progress and Poverty," Book VIII, Chapter II, about a page from the end.

"When the common right to land is so far appreciated that all taxes are abolished save those which fall upon rent, there is no danger of much more than is necessary to induce them to collect the public revenues being left to individual landholders."

In this Henry George at least recognized the possibility of something being left to the landholder in the nature of selling value. I am of those who believe that he thought this to be desirable as well as possible. I believe he meant exactly what he said when he said, "Let them buy and sell, bequeath and devise." Land should be worth at least enough to bring in a year's taxes in case of refusal to pay.

I am not so rash as to predict the conditions that will obtain under the full Single Tax. At the same time I do indulge in speculation and imagination as to what will come to pass. I believe that most, perhaps all, Single Taxers hold that the private and individual possession of land is a necessary condition for the highest civilization. I want to suggest the possibility at least that the retention of a selling value to land may be a necessary cog in the social machinery to render to the individual the things that are the individual's and to Caesar the things that are Caesar's.

Chicago, Ill.

HIRAM B. LOOMIS.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

E. H. BOECK of St. Louis writes: "Your comment in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM points out how impractical it is to have these annual gatherings of Single Taxers when the money they cost could be spent in more practical ways." James B. Ellery of Gloucester, Mass., comments as follows: "I agree with you fully in what you say regarding the Henry George Congresses. Does the money they cost advance the cause as a whole?" E. W. Doty of Cleveland also endorses our opinion, and says: "Some of the papers belonged to a chamber of commerce or rotary meeting. Some of our Single Taxers need to be taught what the Single Tax is and what it is not, especially what it is not."

M. V. WATROS, a new subscriber from Fairhope, Ala., writes: "I knew Henry George well. My most treasured possession is a copy of 'Protection or Free Trade' which was presented to me by Henry George himself."

CHARLES G. MERRELL of Cincinnati, O., has an interesting letter in the *Cincinnati Post* and draws the editor's fire who says partly in reply: "Now that all land has been taken up, there are some who contend dolorously that the passing of the frontier has taken with it the opportunity of individual advancement; that American progress must necessarily slow up." And hasn't it.

THE Henry George League of New Jersey held a largely attended dinner on the evening of December 6, in the Down Town Club of Newark. About 150 were present. Dr. John Dewey, while chiding

midly the attitude of Single Taxers, made an earnest appeal for the consideration of Henry George's teachings. Anna George de Mille, F. C. Leubuscher, and others spoke, Mr. Leubuscher replying to Dr. Dewey's gentle chiding of Single Taxers for not "diversifying their propaganda," quoted from Dr. Dewey's radio address in which the distinguished teacher said: "I do not claim that George's remedy will cure by itself all our ailments. But I do claim that we cannot get rid of our basic troubles without it." The dinner was voted a great success.

WE regret to learn from one of our Australian cotemporaries of the death of E. C. Fletcher of Ularunda, Queensland, long a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM. With his brother he carried on business as a drover in a big way. He was born in Tasmania but finally settled in Queensland. The Brisbane *Courier-Mail* says of him, "The State can ill afford to lose men of the type of E. C. Fletcher."

LOUIS F. WESTON of Cambridge, Mass., writes: "I agree with John Luxton on his comment on Frank Stephen's article, yet with all respect to Mr. Stephens for the splendid work he has done for the cause. To use an old simile, I feel that he is standing so close to a tree that he does not see the forest."

"LIKELY to do more good for the cause than any suggestion yet made is yours in last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM for a Henry George Day observed in all cities and many villages simultaneously. This would attract attention and this is what the movement lacks," writes Lewis H. Clark of Sodus, N. Y.

PAUL MCCOMBS of Austin, Texas, believes that State is ripe for a Single Tax experiment, and he has lived 78 years there.

GEORGE DANA LINN has an admirable article on the first page of the Seattle (Wash.) *Municipal News*.

It is not at all surprising that Otto Cullman's "Twenty Million Dollars Every Day" has aroused much favorable comment throughout the country from men of affairs. Business men especially have been attracted to it.

OUR old friend James F. Morton, of Paterson, N. J., evidently subscribes to the conviction rather widely held that a conspiracy of silence prevails in the press of the country regarding our doctrines. The *Newark Call* failed to print a letter of Mr. Morton's. This was followed by similar action on the part of the *Herald-Tribune*. He points out that the *Literary Digest* "has abandoned its old policy of neutrality and now takes distinct sides of many questions. It does, however, admit correspondence on all of these, except the Single Tax." Perhaps if we made news the papers would print it. It may be said in extenuation that both the *Herald-Tribune* and the *New York Post* printed recently admirable Single Tax letters from E. B. Swinney.

DR. F. MASON PADELFOED, of Fall River, Mass., has issued a new and revised edition of his *Economics of Democracy*, 29 pages and cover. Send ten cents for a copy to Dr. Padelford.

SATURDAY and Sunday, Nov. 24 and 25, were made the occasions of a reception at the Henry George School for the friends and students with the Director and Trustees. The hostesses who supplied refreshments to the visitors were Mrs. Anna George de Mille, Mrs. Fowles, Mrs. Recker, Miss Denbigh, Mrs. Burger and Mrs. Luxton. Both occasions brought forth a large attendance.

THE American Association for Scientific Taxation gave a luncheon at the Hotel Parkside, Gramercy Park, on Nov. 20 in this city and

discussed with one or two of the city officials the effect of land values on city rebuilding.

HENRY WARE ALLEN has just completed the manuscript of a new book which is to be entitled "Prosperity—By the Single Tax." We shall await its appearance with interest.

JAMES B. ELLERY spoke before a representative audience at Gloucester, Mass., in December. The Gloucester *Daily Times* said, "Following his talk great appreciation was expressed for his excellent presentation."

Progress of Melbourne, Australia, gives a very good review of Otto Cullman's "Twenty Million Dollars Every Day."

OSWALD SCHLOCKOW, of Brooklyn, a noted educator and one of the District Superintendents of New York City's Department of Education, has written to John Luxton: "Please accept appreciation of your fine article in defense of democracy in the columns of the *Brooklyn Eagle*. In these days when every theory of government is preached from pulpit and platform except good old fashioned democracy a contribution like yours makes the heart beat faster. May you find many imitators."

To the *Herald-Tribune* of Dec. 20, Walter Lippman contributes an article which is entitled "Back to First Principles." It is an analysis of the vote given by cotton growers in favor of crop control. He also properly characterizes this policy. This article justifies what we have said of Mr. Lippman on another page (under Comment and Reflection) as being right "once in four times." Hats off to Mr. Lippman on this one occasion!

AN important bill will be introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature affecting existing forest land conservation. This is being backed by the New England Conservation Association.

JOHN F. CONROY of 56 Murdock Street, Youngstown, O., runs a weekly column in the Journal of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers of North America, the organization that is trying to unionize the plants of the U. S. Steel Corporation with the aid of the NRA. Mr. Conroy gets more Single Tax in his column than anything else. He knows the real remedy and is trying to make the steel workers see it.

THE Christmas number of *The Listener*, an attractive popular periodical published in London, contains an advertisement of "Progress and Poverty" headed "Poverty in Plenty."

A. C. Campbell of Ottawa, Canada, occupies three pages of the Christmas number of the *Canadian Unionist* in which he further reinforces his doctrine of the Gospel of Plenty.

To be catalogued among prevailing insanities is the Townsend Plan which proposes to pension off every individual over sixty at the rate of \$200 a month. While in receipt of this pension no one of the recipients shall engage in any gainful activity. The author of this Bedlamite plan is reputed to be a fine Christian gentleman. He may be all that, but he needs a little elementary education.

CAN any of our readers help us to locate a little pamphlet on fundamental economics said to have been written by a daughter of Harriet Beecher Stowe, and which opens with a pen picture of a primitive man digging clams on the beach who has fashioned a stick to help him dig—thus representing land, labor and capital?

HENRY B. MAURER, of Cranford, N. J., is about to issue an anthology, mainly of radical verse. Among the selections will be "The Calf Path," by Sam Walter Foss, "Sedition," by Edmund Vance Cooke, "An Ancient Wrong," by Samuel Brazier, "The Bread Line," by Joseph Dana Miller, and many others. In the same volume will be a poem addressed to the President and the latter's gracious acknowledgment.

A RECENT report on the agrarian situation emanating from the government of Mexico states that only one tenth of the land of Mexico is in use.

G. J. KNAPP informs us that the amendment to the Denver charter which was semi-Single Tax was defeated in the election of Nov. 6 by 15,000 votes, so that a change of 7,500 votes would carry it. Another amendment sponsored by the real estate interests was defeated by two to one.

MRS. BESSIE BEACH TRUEHART, of Houston, Texas, informs us of the death of John R. Spencer at the age of 88, a resident for many years of the Union Printer's Home in Colorado Springs, Colo. He passed away peacefully in his sleep. He was prominent for many years in the Union Labor movement and was a staunch Henry George advocate associated with such leaders of the movement as George N. Beach and A. Freeland. "Uncle John," as he was affectionately known, was born in Canton, Ill., and was engaged in the newspaper business. He succeeded the famous Josh Billings as publisher of the Crawford (Texas) *Yeoman* and served as postmaster of Crawford from 1884 to 1888. The Single Tax movement in Texas, particularly, owes much to John R. Spencer as originator and speaker and for the inspiration he gave to younger workers in the cause.

SENATOR STOCKWELL of the Minnesota legislature will introduce a Single Tax bill. According to information the constitution of that State permits the enactment of a Single Tax measure.

"I AM feeling great satisfaction for the many fold return you give for a small subscription payment," writes a new subscriber, F. J. Fee, of Philadelphia.

JOSEPH R. CARROLL, of Norfolk, Conn., has a long letter on the thirty hour week in the *Hartford Courant*. He says in part:

The New Deal notion that industry can pay the same money wages for a short work week as for a longer one, is based evidently upon a lack of knowledge of the real nature of the phenomenon called wages. This is especially noticeable in the process called "priming the pump," which in realty amounts to putting a monkey wrench in the pump. It evidently accepts the mediaeval fallacy that wages are derived from a pre-existing wage fund, whereas, as Henry George showed in his "Progress and Poverty," the real cause of wages is useful and effective exertion on the part of the worker.

The longer and more effectively a given worker or group works, the more opportunity for employment there will be for the remainder of the people.

FLORENCE GARVIN, daughter of the late Governor Garvin of Rhode Island, writes us: "The proposal of Dr. Lavery is very good and should be introduced in the coming Congress. What Dr. Lavery says about the railroads is the voice of forgotten wisdom."

"LAND AND FREEDOM is the finest publication of its kind," writes John W. Keegan, of Forestville, Ill.

DR. JOHN DEWEY, president of the People's Lobby at Washington, and president of the Henry George School of Social Science, said recently at a conference: "Take the measures of the New Deal. You will not find one that is not compromised, prejudiced—yes, nullified—by private monopolization of natural opportunity."

WE have received an interesting letter from Clayton J. Ewing. He left on Jan. 20 for a trip south, and expects to visit Jackson, Miss., New Orleans, Fairhope, and St. Petersburg, Fla. He says: "Many did not appraise Oscar Geiger while living at his real worth. He is more generally recognized now. How great a work he did in founding the School! I first saw him at the New York convention which was the first time I met the great leaders of the movement. I was enraptured at his wonderful oration delivered there, "Natural Law in the Economic World."

THE *World-Herald* of Omaha says editorially: "The Henry George Club is going to discuss taxes and eventually all tax clubs get around to discussing Henry George." The Club met recently and listened to Dr. M. D. Crossett of Lincoln and Henry F. Sarman of Omaha.

CHAS. G. MERRELL writes to the editor of the *Cincinnati Post*:

Land is a heritage to all the children of men from the Creator of the universe and should not be held out of use by any individual, as against those who wish to use it. This could all be accomplished by absorbing the rental value of land into the Government coffers and relieving our people of all other taxation. We would not then be fined, or taxed, for putting up new homes or improving old ones; nor would we be punished by being taxed on industry and thrift, which ought to be encouraged.

This one revision of the tax laws would do more to cure the depression and to prevent others than any other one thing that we could do. It is of course not a universal panacea but it is a fundamental one without which all other procedures are in vain.

More and more men are coming to see this principle enunciated by Henry George fifty years ago, and it is hoped that the day will arrive before long when enough will see the justice of this remedy to put it into effect.

IN a recent issue of the *Toronto University Quarterly* is an article by Prof. Frank H. Knight, professor of political economy at the University of Chicago. It is entitled "Social Science and the Political Trend." With some of the conclusions we might disagree but are glad to quote approvingly the following: "A genuine religious conversion would be necessary for most all the members of any group which should really devote itself to a love of truth and faith in truth." The whole article is singularly thoughtful.

THERE is a rumor that Huey Long will come to Pittsburgh to debate with Mayor McNair. It is said that Senator Long is considering it. An admission fee would be charged, the proceeds to go to unemployment relief.

FRANK H. HOWE, of Columbus, O., sends us an interesting item of news. The Archeological and Historical Museum of that city has acquired a bound volume of *The Radical* published by George Henry Evans, one of our early land reformers, living in Granville, N. J. He was a printer and came from England. In Granville he edited *The Radical* in 1841. George White of Long Branch was the original discoverer of Evans and an account of his life and work appeared in LAND AND FREEDOM. That this volume should have turned up in Columbus is curious. Mr. Evans said in one issue of his paper: "My doctrine is this: the use of land is the equal natural right of all citizens of this and future generations, and therefore that the land should not be a matter of traffic, gift or will. In other words, that the land is not property, and therefore should not be transferable like the products of man's labor."

SAM EWING is correspondent of the *San Francisco News*. He is a newspaper man of wide experience. He quotes from a letter of a friend, Juan Fernandez, a Chilean lawyer, who tells of a building boom in the city of Santiago, Chile, due to a ten years exemption of all buildings in that city. Fully fifteen thousand artisans are being given steady work and whole sections of the city are being built over. This is true of many residences and retail and wholesale stores. New

York can furnish Chile with some interesting and valuable statistics resulting from a similar experiment, of which some of the citizens of Santiago are doubtless informed.

THE *Gazette* of Phoenix, Ariz., prints in its issue of Jan. 7, an editorial under the heading "Depression Forty Years Ago," and makes liberal quotations from Henry George. Some of our readers may recall that a statue of "Bucky" O'Neil, once mayor of Phoenix, adorns the public square. O'Neil was killed at San Juan Hill in the Spanish-American war. We knew him well. He tried to make Phoenix a Single Tax city and nearly succeeded.

UNDER the heading "Waldauer is Back" the *Memphis Press-Scimitar* welcomes Hon. Abe D. Waldauer, who is now back in the City Hall in his old position as first assistant City Attorney.

THE *New York Times'* special correspondent from San Francisco says: "The governor and his advisers fear that the Single Tax scheme will be adopted because of its being linked with repeal of the unpopular sales tax."

THE *Researcher*, an eight page mimeographed paper, is a product of the younger pupils of the Henry George School of New York. This is to be published monthly and is to be credited to Robert Clancy, Robert Black, Max Berkowitz and Miss Edith Salkay.

Reynolds Weekly of London, with a circulation of nearly half a million, and probably read by a million, has an article prominently displayed in its issue of Dec. 16, by J. W. Graham Peace, entitled "Behind the Scenes it is the Land That Always Counts." It is written with his usual vigor of expression. Our congratulations!

"LAND Prices in a Commodity Price System" is a sixteen page pamphlet by Philip H. Cornick, reprinted from a recent issue of the *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*. We hope to give a more extended notice in a future issue. Mr. Cornick is a member of the Schalkenbach Foundation and for many years an active Single Taxer.

A SOUND and scholarly statement of our principles appears in the November issue of *The Tax Magazine* of Chicago from Raymond V. McNally. It is a rebuttal of Dr. Edwin S. Todd's article in a previous issue of that magazine. Needless to say that like everything Mr. McNally writes it is clear and forcibly stated.

democracy (with a small "d") is a "journal of fundamental democracy" edited by Charles H. Ingersoll. Write to the Manhattan Single Tax Club, 1165 Broadway for a sample copy.

GEORGE T. TIDEMAN of Chicago writes: "I still believe in holding conventions. I am convinced that the money so spent would be spent anyway and probably not for Single Tax purposes."

EDWIN L. UPP of McKeesport, Pa., writes: "LAND AND FREEDOM furnishes me with more sound thought than any periodical to which I subscribe. When I have read it I circulate it among a large circle of my friends some of whom at least are beginning to see the necessity for the application of our philosophy to end the depression."

A RECENT monograph by Rosina K. Mohaupt and Alger W. Lane, published by the Research Committee of Wayne University, is entitled "A Description of the English System for the Taxation of Real Property." The authors say:

"Naturally, all vacant land is exempt from taxes . . . although this exemption of vacant property is the crux of the whole system of taxation, it has not worked out satisfactorily in England," con-

clude the authors. "It is generally conceded that it has produced the large slum areas and congested housing, and has forced the central government into large public housing projects. The owner of the land finds no necessity to develop it—he is holding it tax free."

A SERIES of articles on the economic problem is appearing in the *Coshocton (O.) Daily Tribune*, once edited by our old friend Fred S. Wallace and now worthily carried on by his son Robert S. Wallace.

Mayor McNair has appointed Hugo W. Noren, well known Pittsburgh Single Taxer, as a member of the City Board of Assessors, succeeding John J. Murray, who was recently advanced to the position as Director of the Department of Supplies.

Mr. Noren has been a Director of the Henry George Foundation since its inception and was formerly editor of the *Greenfield Bulletin* and has been for many years an active writer and worker in the Single Tax movement.

J. F. COLBERT of Minden, La., writes:

Allow me to make this suggestion, as I did three years ago in a letter to Mr. Percy R. Williams before the meeting of the 6th Congress in Baltimore: Have the national gatherings on the steps of the capitol at Washington. And for this year I suggest it be held in the summer, while Congress is in session, and attempt to get the attention of the country by getting members of Congress to attend and participate in the discussions.

I think, also, that a big school to teach economics should be established in Washington for I believe the best way to get notice throughout the country is to concentrate activities on Washington as much as possible.

I am offering these suggestions for what they may be worth.

I regret to report the death on the 8th inst., at Opelousas, La., of George K. Perrault, member of the Louisiana legislature, serving his third term of eleven years, aged 36, leader of the minority in opposition to Huey P. Long and caucus nominee for speaker when attempt was made last May to reorganize the legislature. He was a convert of the Henry George philosophy through my lending him "Progress and Poverty," and had a brilliant mind and magnetic personality. Formerly subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM, which I had sent to him.

I have been writing some articles for the two local weekly papers recently, and some interest is being manifested by a few readers. The class in civics in the Minden High School has been taking some note of them, I am informed.

EVERYONE who believes in the natural right of labor to use land should read "The Great Bootleg Coal Industry," published in *The Nation* of Jan. 9. Business in the anthracite coal industry has been slack for many years. The owners of coal lands have been getting out the reduced product with less labor, and even as far back as 1920 equipment became so efficient that additional thousands were thrown out of work. Since that time the unemployed miners have been digging coal from the outcroppings and selling it or exchanging it to pay their living expenses. This practice showed a marked increase during the strike of 1925 and a further increase since, assuming large proportions following the depression of 1929. At this date "bootleg" coal is being dug over a territory of 500 miles, in or near thirty cities and towns of the coal region, keeping directly employed one hundred thousand men and boys, and dependants, who otherwise would have to be supported by public relief. This "bootleg" industry has paid taxes and enabled families to remain in their communities. Indirectly it has been the means of keeping other thousands employed, including truckmen and transportation industries. The amount involved in 1933 is estimated as between thirty and thirty-five million dollars and in 1934 as between forty and forty-five millions, sold and distributed over at least five states.

It will interest the reader to reflect what it will mean to break up this industry and its effect politically. He will be interested in the attitude of the state authorities and of the church. He will be interested in the suggestion that the coal mines be nationalized and may ask why go to such trouble? Why not tax the lands into use? But what is demonstrated is that men will make their living if permitted access to the earth.