

July—August, 1935

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

The Soldier---Then and Now

Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn

Frank Stephens Passes

The Coming Henry George Congress

Opinion Makers in Our Day

John Collins

Norman C. B. Fowles Examines Emil Jorgeson and
Benjamin W. Burger Does the Same Service for Mr. Ogden

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., 302 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 subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

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

JULY—AUGUST, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 4 WHOLE No. 191

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. Matheu 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.....	107
THE SOLDIER—THEN AND NOWRabbi Michael Aaronsohn	109
FRANK STEPHENS PASSES.....	111
ON THE MARCH WITH JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE	112
ACTIVITIES OF MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB	113
THE CALIFORNIA MOVEMENT.. Hon Jackson H. Ralston	114
HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS TO MEET SEPT. 23-25....	115
HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT DINNERMargaret F. Bingham	116
OPINION MAKERS IN OUR DAY.....John Collins	119
MISCELLANY.....	121
BOOK REVIEWS ...Norman C. B. Fowles, Walter Fairchild, B. W. Burger	125
CORRESPONDENCE.....	131
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	135

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

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

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

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

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

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

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXV

JULY—AUGUST, 1935

No. 4

Comment and Reflection

IT is characteristic of current thinking that it deals with surface indications. One would scarcely imagine that all of these problems we call problems of distribution were existant prior to the invention of money and prior to the establishment of forms of government. When wealth is considered it is estimated in the form of money; when wages are spoken of the mind thinks of so many dollars a day, or so many shillings a week. And it goes no further than that.

IT is perhaps no exaggeration to say that half of our so-called economic works of the present decade deal with the subject of money, and hence the basic fundamental laws of political economy have been utterly lost in their reasoning and calculations. This has resulted in the world losing sight of much economic phenomena that is more important and entirely independent of money systems, stable money, the gold standard, bi-metalism, greenbackism, and all the host of related theories and fallacies covering the medium of exchange. In this welter of confusion, this Babel of tongues, the really significant things are rarely touched upon.

ALL the fundamental phenomena of distribution are prior to the invention of money and remain under all systems of coinage. Men work and produce, and are robbed of the fruits of their toil through tariffs and taxes, and the private collection of the rent of land. Thus the masses of men are kept in poverty because of institutions independent of all mediums of exchange, which while not unimportant are purely subsidiary and, measured fundamentally, largely negligible.

IF we keep in mind the true connotations respecting money, while realizing that faulty monetary systems *do* cause loss and inconvenience, we shall be nearer to the solution of all real economic problems. But so long as we imagine that these problems can be solved through approaches to money or changes in the monetary system (vide Father Coughlin) we are traveling *from* and not *toward* a real solution.

BUT there is one thing that is significant and reassuring. That is that the social ferment is now mount-

ing to the top. It is no longer confined to the members of the lower strata, the less influential groups, but the Church, and notably the Catholic Church, is showing signs of uneasiness. The phenomenon of Dr. Coughlin, despite his concern with the superficialities of the problem, as for example the question of money to which we have had occasion to refer, is not unpromising in the welter of confusion to which he has in some measure contributed. And this not merely because of his occasional hints at something more fundamental, but because here is a priest of the Church who for the first time in several decades speaks for the disinherited, and, doffing his priestly robes, appears in the character of an American citizen in a fearless assault against what he regards as economic abuses.

JUST how much of this has the friendly countenance of the Pope, just how much of it is due to example set by the Supreme Ruler of the Church, it is of course impossible to say. Let the reader's memory go back to Elizabeth Barrett Browning, who, disappointed at the failure of the then Supreme Pontiff to carry out the liberal professions of his earlier years, wrote these bitter lines:

"Perhaps it is that other eyes may see
From Casa Guidi windows what is done
Or undone; but whatsoever deed they be
Pope Pius will be glorified in none."

IT may be said with confidence that it is doubtful if ever again another Elizabeth Barrett Browning will be able justly to voice such criticism. The present Pope appears in a very different light. A benignant presence rules at the Vatican. Despite the dignity of his great office, he is a lovable personality. A change has come over the Church, a very subtle but very noticable change. The social ferment has risen. In high places now the economic and social structure of society is being subjected to searching questions. There is everywhere a suspicion that the foundations of society are unsound. From this inquiry nothing but good can come.

WE repeat that the phenomena of Dr. Coughlin and his Bishop are distinctly reassuring. Confident

as we are that the remedy proposed by Henry George is the true one we can afford to wait on the development of independent thinking among the clergy to straighten out the confused thinking which after all is not important if men, including churchmen, are free to think and express their thought. For there are other Father Coughlins to come. If we believe a change has arrived it will not be long before some great voice will be heard from the Church with a message that will ring round the globe.

WE have read with gratification the admirably reasoned defense of Father Coughlin from his Bishop, Michael Gallagher, and again we can afford to ignore the implications of the philosophy for the vastly more important declaration of the intellectual independence of the priesthood. Despite the influence that must have been brought to bear to close the lips of the priest, the Bishop gives him his imprimatur, which is "leave to print," in this case the leave to speak. He says: "It does not mean that the Bishop agrees with everything to which he has given his imprimatur." And again: "His judgments are necessarily personal judgments but they are absolutely essential to estimate the ratio of our nation's debt to our nation's wealth or to see a just rate of interest on mortgaged property."

THE language is a little loose here. But again we can afford to ignore it for the fine sympathy exhibited throughout by His Excellency, and the courage with which he faces the question of the inequitable distribution of wealth. If he does not get close to the problem the important thing is that he recognizes it. In declaring for the freedom of Father Coughlin to circulate his written and spoken word "without objection throughout the land," His Excellency has ranged himself with the great leaders of the Church who, fearless and intrepid, have borne witness to the truth as they saw it. When he says: "Father Coughlin preaches the doctrine of *social justice for all*" we cannot doubt that he believes this and will stand by him when and if he does. What more can we ask? We repeat, the social ferment is rising.

WALTER LIPPMAN is most impressive in his title heads. We are held in pleasurable anticipation of what we may look for in the subject matter—only in most cases to be disappointed. Maybe the *Herald-Tribune's* heading to his recent Phi Beta Kappa address at Harvard is not his, but it is so close an imitation to his habitual title heads as to serve for an example. The heading is as follows: "Lippman Tells Youth to Hold Economic Liberty as Its Ideal." Looks promising for a moment, doesn't it?

EVER since Mr. Lippman as a young man started out with his friend Croly to write on economic and social questions he has been like that. He indicates fundamentals only to evade them a few paragraphs later—perhaps in the very same paragraph. He is very attractive, he is a master of English and apparent coherency. We listen entranced if we do not stop to ask inconvenient questions. In this address he talks of "economic liberty"—he uses the phrase at least—but it is quite clear that he does not know what it is. He has approved and condemned the experimentation and regulation that have gone on under the present administration. He was never quite certain where he stood.

HE has no full conception of what constitutes "economic liberty." Otherwise he would have swept away with one impressive condemnation the preposterous experiments of the Roosevelt Administration. He would have been able to see that one man at least, in an epoch-making work, had talked understandingly of "economic liberty." He would have gone to Henry George instead of ignoring him. The challenge that this unknown printer made to the world over fifty years ago is as vital now as it was in the time it was written, and it will remain vital until it is answered. Lippman is like so many of his cotemporaries that have gained the ear of a half cultured and superficially thinking public, so enamoured of their own wordy speculations and phrases that seem to mean something but slip away from the understanding like so many slippery snakes, that if they ever hit upon some fundamental principle, it is by the merest accident and is promptly forgotten.

MR. LIPPMAN says in this address at Harvard: "We are unable to transmit from our generation to the next a credible and coherent tradition." It is not so much a tradition that is needed as an understanding. Economic liberty is impossible without a place to work, and land is a place to work. We thank Brother Foley for that contribution to clear thinking. We commend it to Mr. Lippman. If he will prayerfully consider it he will write fewer words but he will write more sense.

THE text book on physics used in Cincinnati high schools during the 1880's declared a heavier-than-air flying machine impossible because no engine powerful enough to lift the weight of a man could lift its own weight. Probably the same or similar textbooks were used in most other cities. We may laugh at this teaching now but it is no laughing matter, for it undoubtedly discouraged much research and effort that may have given us the airplane sooner and given us more time for progress in air navigation. Similarly fallacies taught today in universities as economics, which may be laughed at forty years hence, constitute no laughing matter.

The Soldier—Then and Now*

SPEECH IN TOLEDO, O., BY RABBI MICHAEL AARONSOHN,
BEFORE THE 37TH DIVISION OF THE A. E. F. ASSOCIATION

SEVENTEEN years ago our national life was imperiled, and we did something about it. Thoroughly unprepared for modern warfare, nevertheless we brought the World War to a close by the most thrilling demonstration of dynamic idealism in the story of man.

Whatever others may say in deprecation of the part we played in that historic drama, none can take from us the passion of patriotism we enjoyed in those days, which tried every man's soul. Our detractors may scoff, but we were happy warriors. Seventeen years ago when we National Guardsmen of Ohio were mustered into the Federal service we looked upon ourselves as the chosen defenders of the nation—indeed, as the champions of the rights of the common people in every part of the world.

Now when you and I were formally inducted into the Federal service, we pledged ourselves to defend our country and our American Constitution. Such an oath taken under such stirring circumstances is as binding today as it was in August, 1917. A certificate of discharge and the payment of a bonus could not relieve us of the obligation to defend our country and to preserve our Constitution. We who witnessed the lives of our comrades snuffed out on the field of battle, we who are acquainted with the grief and the travail of our disabled comrades, cannot be discharged from active service either by the free-will offerings of grateful countrymen, or by the gratuities wrested from a ballot-conscious Congress. We can but hold all medals, all such flattering forms of tribute, in disdain. The love we have for our country cannot be bartered away. That flame of patriotism can be extinguished neither by ingratitude, nor by ridicule, nor by pensions. We were soldiers in 1917, we are soldiers today—ready again to defend our country and to preserve our American Constitution.

We recognize that eternal vigilance must be the watchword of every National Guardsman of our Republic. We know how dangerous it is to be lulled into innocuous passive-ism. We have innumerable foes that day and night work for our destruction. More than we realize

During the War Michael Aaronsohn served as Sergeant-Major, 147th Regiment, U. S. Infantry. Following the Armistice he became actively interested in veteran welfare. For six years he was National Chaplain of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War. At present he is chaplain, 37th Division, A. E. F. Association; president, 147th Regiment Association; chaplain of various veteran posts in Cincinnati. For eight years he was the National Field Representative of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. He is now engaged in the preparation of an autobiographic account of World War experiences.

He is a close friend of Mr. Abe D. Waldauer of Memphis, Tenn.

the foes we must be most wary of are those which in satanic strategy center their attacks upon the moral and spiritual unity of our countrymen. For our enemies know that so long as we have a virtuous population that will rise up and stand as a wall of steel around our Republic, we need have no fear of invasion. But in any event, when the national life is threatened, either by enemies from without or enemies from within, we National Guardsmen must not be silent, we must not compromise our patriotism; we must do something about it.

Confident of the unsurpassed will and power of my fellow-countrymen to triumph over every natural and human force that now tries the nation's spirit, I warn you not to look to Europe for a way out of our economic dilemma. We can, we will be victorious eventually if we patiently rely upon the honor, the good sense, and the virtues of our American prophets. We must not borrow patterns of government. All that we need today are men of courage and vision, men in whom there is the spirit of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln to show us the way to victory.

As I survey the childish practices of politicians, as I consider the collective irresponsibility and abject abdication of authority on the part of our legislators, as I weigh the words of clergymen and educators, as I examine the experiments of statesmen and industrialists, as I observe the enslavement of nearly thirty million of my countrymen to poverty and to the fear of poverty, as I study the supreme paradox of the ages—untold millions of unemployed, under-nourished, world-weary, crushed men, women, and children tramping the streets and highways of the cities and villages of this opulent Republic,—I marvel that this nation, so incomparably great in war, should appear so helpless in the solution of our political-economic imbroglio. Surely in this generation we are not lacking men of vision and courage and talent needed for this crisis! We were soldiers in the World War; we are soldiers today; our country and our Constitution are in danger. We must do something about it.

With the utmost respect for your intelligence and patriotism I am going to set before you this afternoon a plan of action no less American in spirit and content than the Declaration of Independence, the Federal Constitution, and the Gettysburg Address of Abraham Lincoln. The sure remedy that I shall prescribe for the salvation of our national life was conceived by an extraordinary American more than fifty years ago, and was dedicated to the proposition that all men are created by God for the full and noble enjoyment, according to each man's capacity and taste, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The programme I shall advocate is not in the nature of political reformation. It has no conflict with the Constitution. Actually it calls for the fulfillment of the American dream of democracy. It provides for a minimum of public regulation, and for a

maximum of personal liberty and security. It is the Single Tax programme as divinely set forth by that illustrious American whom Prof. John Dewey ranks among the greatest of the great of all times—that American philanthropist and prophet, Henry George of blessed memory.

In essence the Single Tax programme of Henry George calls for a drastic revision and simplification of our system of taxation. With all my faith I affirm that had our statesmen in 1881 carried out the true principles of political economy as set forth by Henry George, panics, depressions, mass unemployment, and the general demoralization of industry and commerce would be as obsolete today as are the leech and the barber in the field of medicine, the astrologer and the alchemist in the field of science, and wizards and witches in the field of religion. We must confess that in the field of political economy we are just as backward today as were the Egyptians in the days of the pyramid-building Pharaohs. Foremost among the nations of the world in industry, commerce, invention, and in all the arts and sciences; advanced in religious and intellectual tolerance, we are nevertheless in our present system of taxation as benighted as were the Romans in the days of the Caesars. Our glorious ideal of democracy has been mischievously entangled by a Gordian knot of unnatural, unreasonable, and mutually destructive forms of taxation: forms of taxation that strike down brave and free men in their quest for honest employment, that rob labor and capital of their just rewards, that enchain the farmer, that crush the life out of industry and commerce, and that like vampire-bats suck the life-blood out of the nation.

Centuries ago the legends of the Orient foretold that whosoever loosed the Gordian knot would become the master of Asia. Alexander the Great cut the knot with the keen edge of his sword. We soldiers of a former day, we soldiers of today, can cut the Gordian knot that is now choking the life out of our nation if we will but dare to strike through with the keen edge of the sword of truth.

We can extirpate poverty, we can increase the wages of the workmen, we can secure the investment of the merchant and the manufacturer, we can provide decent employment for all our countrymen, we can root out crime and vice, we can diffuse wealth universally, we can do justice to the veteran, to the widow, to the orphan, to the infirm, and to all the forgotten men and women and children in every part of this wonderful country, we can insure the income and the independence of the farmer, we can effect sweeping reductions in the budgetary requirements of municipal, State and Federal departments of government, we can provide houses of learning for all our children, we can prevent political and moral disintegration, we can make gigantic strides towards social, industrial, and even world peace—if we will but obey the laws of nature and of God; if we will but heed

the voices of history and of science;—we can do all these things by applying the simple and sovereign remedy of the Single Tax programme of Henry George.

It is altogether fitting and significant that so righteous and yet so simple a plan of national and world recovery should thus be publicly advocated by an American soldier. For all the land we so proudly call our own, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from Canada to Mexico, together with Alaska, Hawaii, and all other possessions of this empire-republic—was for the most part won and secured by the valor, the sacrifices, and the perseverance of the American soldier.

It is important that we bear this fundamental principle in mind because the Single Tax of Henry George has its basis in the right to the use of all land, together with the payment of community-rent to the State in the form of a tax on the bare value of land only. There is to be no confiscation of land. There is to be no change in the method of sale or the use of land, and no monopoly, no calamitous speculation in land. Furthermore, instead of a multiplicity of altogether unjust and monstrous forms of tax-exploitation, we will have but a Single Tax on the site value of the land, which the courage and the will to sacrifice of the American soldier under the grace of God now make secure for the use and the blessing of all.

Soldiers of 1917; Soldiers of today; we have no selfish ends, no private interests to serve. That flame of patriotism still burns brightly in our souls, and we can feed that flame by the knowledge of the presence of kindred living spirits in every part of this country yearning and praying, as I do, from day to day for fresh opportunities, for creative and upbuilding service under the Stars and Stripes.

On this day of our reunion and of our rededication to the ideals and to the patterns of the master-builders of our Republic, I present the ethical and economic testament of Henry George as the American programme. It is for you, my comrades, to study, to know, and then to become the persuasive dauntless advocates of this simple and sound system of harmonious social life within the wise and immortal frame of the American Constitution. Hours thus spent in an earnest effort to bring about this reconstruction of our tottering political-economic foundations by freeing our countrymen from the tyranny of taxation,—without the sacrifice of life or limb—will speedily be rewarded by God with victory and peace, liberty, justice, and plenty for all the sons and daughters of America.

A proposed solution of an economic problem which includes depriving a wealth producer of part of his product deserves no consideration. Social justice can not be secured through legalized robbery. No one who advocates such a measure, however sincere, can be a safe economic guide.

Frank Stephens Passes

THE death of Frank Stephens on June 16 takes from us one of the last surviving members of the Old Guard. A leader in the Delaware campaign, a member of the Dover Jail Club where a group of Single Taxers were arrested and imprisoned, one of the old time editors of *Justice*, prominent in the enclavial movement, active in the Committee of 48, present at nearly every one of the Henry George Congresses during successive years, and a devoted friend of Henry George whom he knew personally, his activities were co-extensive with the history of the movement for more than fifty years.

And in those years he was foremost in the war for social justice. A moving orator and personally lovable, he probably had a larger number of friends and admirers than any man in the movement. There were angles to his beliefs and convictions which were occasionally puzzling to his associates, but on the fundamentals he never wavered. He approached the great problem from the ethical angle, and he was a strong individualist and a stickler for freedom. He was, despite his questionings, a tower of strength to the movement for nearly six decades.

It was but a few weeks before his death that he dined on May 27 at the White House by invitation of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt whom he had met during her visit to Arden. There were present at this luncheon only a few but these included Mrs. Louis Howe and John Roosevelt. The subject discussed was homesteads and it is easy to imagine that Frank did not neglect the opportunity to present to the First Lady of the land the broader aspects of the question. Mrs. Roosevelt obtained first-hand information of the Single Tax enclaves where the principles of Henry George are to some extent recognized. Mr. Stephens told us before the occasion of this luncheon how much impressed he was by Mrs. Roosevelt's fine sympathies and her evident willingness to learn of anything that might conduce to social betterment.

Frank Stephens was 75 years of age. His death resulted from a sudden heart attack. He leaves a widow and two sons. He was born at Rahway in 1859 and graduated from Rutgers College. He taught sculpture at the Academy of Fine Arts in the Drexel Institute in Philadelphia. He was a lecturer for the New York Board of Education, Swarthmore Chautauqua and other organizations. With the late Will Price, who was an architect and a Single Taxer, he established the well-known Single Tax colony at Arden, Del. He associated himself with Fiske Warren in the founding of Single Tax "enclaves" and these two men were warm friends.

In the earlier days of the movement he worked with such well-known Single Taxers as Sam Millikin, Arthur Stephenson, Dr. Solis Cohen, Arthur C. Pleydell, William Ryan, Harold Sudell, and others of the faithful residing

in Philadelphia. He did yeoman work as a member of this group.

Frank Stephens' body was cremated on the afternoon of June 17 according to his wishes.

From *Every Evening* of Wilmington we extract the following:

Saturday night the two sons visited their father at Gilpin's Point. He had not seen them for several weeks and was so overjoyed at their visit that he immediately organized a campfire and invited neighbors.

"The campfire was the same as that we have in Arden," said Donald today. "My father proved the life of the evening. He sang, recited and read Uncle Remus stories to us. He appeared to be in the best of health."

Early yesterday morning Mr. Stephens suffered a heart attack. Shortly before noon he appeared to be out of danger. He assured his sons there was nothing to worry about. The two sons then left by auto for Arden.

Unknown to them the father turned over on his side and closed his eyes in death just as the auto with his two sons left Gilpin's Point.

So died Frank Stephens, one of the many whom Henry George had touched with divine fire. But his work lives after him. Such a life is an inspiration. And his death is a distinct personal loss to many; the work he did and the example of his life and great service will re-act for many years to come.

From Dr. Solomon S. Cohen in a letter just received we quote the following:

We who worked with Frank Stephens, who were taught by him, and who heard him talk, on and off the platform, who were associated with him in the days of Delaware, cannot think of him as dead. His memory is a memory of vitality and vigor, of intense conviction, of earnest presentation. His was a logical philosophy, and at great sacrifice he made his life conform to it. His departure reduces yet further the small number of those who knew and worked with Henry George, and is a distinct loss of strength to the Georgian movement.

Lover of truth and freedom, brother to all mankind, loyal servant of the Idea, faithful friend, we shall miss him greatly in the few days that to us remain.

The following editorial appeared in the *Philadelphia Ledger*:

A well-known sculptor and teacher of art, Frank Stephens died last Sunday at Gilpin, Md. Monuments to his artistic abilities are some of the statues in Philadelphia City Hall. But his name was once more widely identified with the community of Arden, Del., which he founded to prove and practice his faith in the theory of Single Tax, as advocated by Henry George.

It is evidence of his executive abilities and the intensity of his convictions that he was the recognized leader of the Arden experiment for thirty-five years. It could be argued, indeed, that the community would hardly have kept its character so long without the presence of a strong and stubborn personality. Few theories in economics which contradict conventional practice and opinion can stand alone. Somebody must believe in them with abiding faith to perpetuate them against the pressure of the world about them.

There have been numerous experiments in social management and organization, under the tolerance allowed by the American system of government. Not the least interesting is the colony of Arden, now lacking the man who fought for the doctrine of Single Tax both in theory and practice.

Harold Sudell addressed the following letter to the *Philadelphia Ledger*:

On behalf of the Single Taxers of Philadelphia and its vicinity permit me to thank you for your kindly editorial on the passing of Frank Stephens of Arden. A man of brilliant mind, unusual ability and with a most loveable disposition, he gave up almost the whole of a long life to the service of his fellow-men. For half a century his main object was to bring about better social conditions through the adoption of the Henry George philosophy. No effort was too arduous and no sacrifice too great if the Single Tax cause could be helped by it.

He did not live to see the day of its coming but it is good to know that his unselfish work for the benefit of others was not unappreciated by many who knew him even if they did not see eye to eye with him as regards mankind's right to the use of the earth.

It was somewhat of a coincidence that on the day of his cremation the State Senate of Harrisburg should have defeated, by a vote of 32 to 17, the first bill ever before a Pennsylvania Legislature to give a measure of the Single Tax to the City in which Henry George, the Apostle of the Single Tax, was born. However, in view of the general lack of knowledge as to the Single Tax and its workings it is encouraging to know that 17 of our Senators would vote for such a measure. For no work had been done except on the committee which reported the bill favorably. So, if Frank Stephens were still here, he would be encouraged by the result of this vote.

A TRIBUTE FROM GRACE COLBRON

A living flame, smouldering always, then flashing out in bursts of brilliance . . . that was Frank Stephens.

As man . . . each day a new adventure for him. Nothing that had gone before could spoil his zest for each new happening.

As Thinker and Fighter . . . enlisting heart and soul for a dozen reforms but always in final clear realization of what was greatest of all; willing to sacrifice all the others for what he felt was fundamental Truth.

The sort of man to whom no one could remain indifferent. One either liked him whole-heartedly . . . or disliked him vehemently . . . sometimes both at one and the same time. That was Frank Stephens.

As speaker . . . one of the best. Standing at first with eyes half-closed, the rich voice muted, apparently neither caring for, or even aware of, his audience. Then gathering them up in growing fervor, sweeping them away in a torrent of eloquence that held them spellbound, thrilled, shaken. That was Frank Stephens.

Memory brings up one experience of Frank Stephens as speaker.

An actor friend was my guest, a man of intelligence, himself a good speaker with a fine voice which he knew how to use. We sat facing the audience. Frank was at his best that night.

Once I glanced at my friend. He was studying the audience intently. When the applause died away, I turned to get his reaction. It was enthusiastic. "I have never seen anyone, speaker or actor, hold an audience so completely in his power. He drew them up to the heights, then flung them down to the depths, almost in one breath. He played on their emotions as an organist might play on his great keyboard. It was magnificent."

Yes, even to an outsider, that was Frank Stephens. To us his comrades, and to the cause in which all his power was enlisted, his loss goes deep.

FATHER COUGHLIN denounces the tariff as a sales tax operating entirely in favor of big business. Since all taxes on industry hurt the weak more than the strong the good father tells us nothing new, but it is nevertheless encouraging to note this glimmer of light in his tax programme.

On the March With John Lawrence Munroe

FIELD DIRECTOR, THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF
SOCIAL SCIENCE

SPEAKING APPOINTMENTS, MAY-JUNE, 1935

(With the approximate attendance and the name of person by whom each appointment was secured.)

Indianapolis, Ind.—Public meeting in Cropsey Auditorium, Public Library; 20; William E. Barker, Chairman; May 31.

Covington, Ky.—Junior Chamber of Commerce; 60; Paul C. Williamson, Pres.; arranged by Charles H. Haase; June 3.

Dayton, O.—Annual Banquet, School of Commerce, Y. M. C. A. Junior College; 25; Dean Alan S. Wilson; June 4.

Cincinnati, O.—Conference, home of Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn, 318 Forest Avenue, 18; June 5.

Niles, O.—Exchange Club; 30; James F. Wick; June 17.

Youngstown, O.—United Labor Congress; 50; John F. Conroy; June 17. Henry George Land Restoration League; 50; W. O. Blase, Pres.; June 20.

Coshocton, O.—Rotary Club; 60; Fred Cantwell; June 18.

Painesville, O.—Public Meeting; 25; H. Bieder; June 26.

FIELD NOTES

Indianapolis, Ind.—A train boy sold Tom L. Johnson the copy of "Social Problems" that was to make him one of the great leaders in the Henry George movement. That train boy is living today in Indianapolis—Frank Brown, now a coffee merchant. Mr. Brown is proud of his convert for what he accomplished. But George J. Lindeman of Indianapolis is proud of another convert for what he is going to accomplish. Mr. Lindeman's convert is youthful O. B. Hanger. Mr. Hanger is active among the Young Republicans, is an able speaker, and is unique and persuasive in his approach to the philosophy of Henry George. He is a recent graduate of law school, and has his own successful insurance business. He is interested in the Henry George School of Social Science and will make an excellent teacher. Among others who will assure the success of Extension Classes in Indianapolis are Mr. William E. Barker, who once introduced Henry George in a campaign in Rhode Island, and his son-in-law, Russell Edwards.

Covington, Ky.—An extension course of the School will be sponsored in the fall by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. There is not a finer nor more wide awake group of young men in the country than is to be found in this organization. On June 10, following a talk by

Mr. Monroe on "Youth and the New Frontier," a committee was appointed to arrange for the ten-weeks class. Mr. James E. Gunning is chairman. Others actively interested include Paul C. Williamson, president of the Junior Chamber, Thomas Logan, attorney; and Dr. Thomas Sullivan, who first became interested in Henry George through Rev. Herbert Bigelow.

Cincinnati, O.—A couple of years ago the Schalkenbach Foundation circularized the Rabbis of the nation with copies of Henry George's address on "Moses", and Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn of Cincinnati read it and was impressed. Last summer, instead of going to the University as he usually does, he read "Progress and Poverty." During the year that has elapsed his devotion to the cause of Henry George has mounted with time for reflection. He has delivered several important addresses on the philosophy before conventions of veterans' organizations in which he is active. When Mr. Monroe came to Cincinnati in June he arranged a conference at his home. Among his guests were Dr. Abraham Cronbach, Professor of Jewish Social Studies, Hebrew Union College, Rev. Carl H. Olson, First Universalist Church; and a number of Henry George people including, Rev. Herbert Bigelow, Mr. and Mrs. Oscar A. Toepfert, Fenton Lawson, Francis B. McConaughy and Robert C. Harris. As a result of this conference, extension classes will open in Cincinnati in the fall. The extension committee is composed of Mr. McConaughy, chairman, Rabbi Aaronsohn, vice-chairman, and Mr. E. E. Hardcastle, secretary.

Writing to the School, Rabbi Aaronsohn says, "I feel we have gone forward. You must keep in constant touch with us until we are firmly established. We want to be an active part of a very active whole." It is this spirit that will put the School "over the top." Rabbi Aaronsohn, by the way, was with Abe D. Waldauer in the Argonne, where he lost his sight. He has "Significant Paragraphs" in Braille, though the unabridged edition of "Progress and Poverty" was read to him by his associate, Rabbi Harry B. Pastor.

Other cities in Ohio which will have extension classes starting in the fall are Hamilton, Dayton, Coshocton, Youngstown, Warren and Painesville, as well as Toledo, which has already brought two classes to a close, and Cleveland, which had its first commencement dinner on June 27 with 131 graduated from four classes. Details as to the progress of the extension classes in these and other cities throughout the country will be published in the next issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

THE New York State Constitution, Article I, Section 10, reads "The people, in their right of sovereignty, are deemed to possess the original and ultimate property in, and to all lands within the jurisdiction of the State."

Activities of the Manhattan Single Tax Club

THE opportunity to reach from 50,000 to a quarter million of the lay-public weekly is of great importance, and in my estimation, of greater importance than any lecturing or publicity work that has so far been done.

The knowledge of radio technique and the extent of the audience is so rare at this stage of the radio development, that I have asked Mr. Lane, who has assisted me in getting 'time' for over 2,000 broadcasts in the last three years, to make a statement which I am appending.

The vital thing is to get radio fans to tune in and to assimilate the talks, in order to do which you will notice from examples herewith, I am using the simplest of language and avoiding technical phrases familiar to Single Taxers, my only idea being to abate nothing of the principle while avoiding unfamiliar terms.

CHAS. H. INGERSOLL.

FROM SECRETARY LANE

To help get the attention of friends of the Henry George movement that Mr. Ingersoll's broadcasting deserves, I would like to state certain facts that they probably know nothing of:

Mr. Ingersoll is cultivating a public taste for economics, by his ingenious and intriguing interweaving of the 'dismal science' with daily happenings; and by the judicious use of a most active sense of humor. From many quarters it is evident that he has reduced to a fine art this balancing of entertainment with education.

Furthermore, he is converting the programme directors of the radio stations to the idea that radio audiences are not averse to listening to common sense, if attractively presented.

Mr. Ingersoll's radio technique equals that of any broadcaster, I firmly believe; it is marvelous, the amount of material he can pack into a 15 minute talk, without apparent haste, and with every important word, point and sentence made completely impressive.

This schedule, now at sixteen broadcasts, (temporarily down from twenty) is not only double a year ago in number, but many times multiplied in character of stations, and total size of audience.

Sunday: WHOM, 10 p. m.

Monday: WCNW, 2:30 p. m., WHOM, 10 p. m.

Tuesday: WOV, 11:15 a. m., WLTH, 1:15 p. m., WCNW, 2:30 p. m., WHOM, 10 p. m.

Wednesday: WWRL, 1:15 p. m., WCNW, 2:30 p. m., WHOM, 10 p. m.

Thursday: WCNW, 2:30 p. m., WHOM, 10 p. m.

Friday: WILM, 3:30 p. m., Wilmington; WDAS, 5:15 p. m., Philadelphia.

Saturday: WDAS, 10:45 a. m., WWRL, 10:45 p. m.
These stations are all 1400 to 1500 k.c.

While methods of measuring actual listeners to a given broadcast are not perfect, there is no doubt that Mr. Ingersoll's audiences on these stations average 5,000 as a minimum and most likely go to a total of 250,000 weekly.

Confirming this estimate are the commercial values of the time on the air that Mr. Ingersoll, because of his name, and the merit of his broadcasts, gets free:—the Standard Rate and Data Service publishes the detailed rate for all the stations of the country; and it shows that *these spots of fifteen minutes as scheduled each would be billed to any commercial buyer at \$452.29 per week cash.*

As to expansion of this economic broadcasting; this may be done without limit, and with decreasing resistance, as Mr. Ingersoll's splendid work becomes more familiar to programme directors; it is only a matter of persistence—in which I know no equal to Mr. Ingersoll—to get to the very top—the big network; and only a nominal effort will be required to build his broadcasting to many times its present distribution.—THOMAS T. LANE

Following are three extracts from Mr. Ingersoll's radio addresses:

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment is on the increase and that goes for both labor and capital. The official figures from Washington tell us that unemployment has gone up something like a half million in the last month and not much less increase for the past year; of course Miss Secretary Perkins will now issue an interpretation of these official figures in language possibly not quite familiar to radio fans; but even she will not dare claim any improvement; so much for labor.

Now the New York State Banking Department has announced the reduction of bank interest rates from two and one-half per cent to two per cent; so page Dr. Coughlin and let him know that Wall Street is also suffering from unemployment; this and the Morgan item should gradually gain his sympathy for Wall Street and maybe a little less for Huey Long and the President, socking the rich and taxing big business until it's little; and to all of these campaigners:—*you cannot injure capital without injuring labor and you cannot injure wealth without injuring both capital and labor; but you can wipe out and destroy monopoly; and if you do not, you may as well forget these other raids you all propose.*

TRUE CONSERVATISM

The conservative Democrats and the conservative Republicans are showing signs of getting together to oppose radicalism in both parties. Ex-Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby, and Chief Justice Pattangall, of Maine, are the voices of this urge; and I have been much interested to read their respective statements of the needs of our country for a party of conservatism, and these statements are well phrased and unquestionably cover real and fundamental needs. Nevertheless, I fail to see in either of these statements the needed definition of those two words *conservative* and *radical*, without which definition we must assume that conservatism means standing still and doing nothing, as distinguished from the radicalism that plunges into beaureaucratic and socialistic experiments. Without the new and only logical definition, this movement is foredoomed to failure in meeting the demands of the hour. *Conservatism is conserving the social value of the nation, in order to make them in turn conserve the private property and wealth of the people. If bi-partisanship can agree on this definition, the time of our deliverance is approaching.*

MEMORIAL DAY

The day on which we would recall the extreme service and the supreme sacrifice of our army veterans we decorate the graves of those that lost out in the ridiculously unequal battle of brain and brawn against bullets.

It seems to me rather a waste of a day if sentiment and emotion—even if patriotic—be its objective; but if we could devote it honestly to looking war squarely and unflinchingly in the face, as our boys faced the enemy's guns, it might become our most useful patriotic holiday.

Armistice Day, Memorial Day and the 4th of July, as days of glorification or toleration of the institution of mass murder, ought to be discouraged; and these days should be devoted to humble search for the reason why a pretentious civilization such as ours falls for almost complete self-destruction periodically. Socialists and Communists are setting us a good example in refusal to countenance war; they are our only persistent and consistent conscientious objectors; they say wars are promoted by the capitalist class to maintain its supremacy and forestall revolution.

But because they have confused capital with special privilege, their fallacy is one of continuing war of class against class and with no peace at the end even if succeeding in their aims; revolution is their only way of achievement.

But there is a simple way to avoid war and revolution—the democratic way of denying to any but the producers any part in the division of the product; this would double wages, provide jobs for all and make buying power always sufficient to insure good times to all.

And while it may not seem obvious that depression, unemployment and poverty cause our international wars, I am sure that the honest inquiry these patriotic holidays might afford would show these economic conditions of distress to be the only cause of wars.

The California Movement

I WANT to submit a partial report of the progress of the movement to secure the adoption of the constitutional amendment in the State of California which looks forward to the speedy installation of at least fifty per cent of the great reform in which we are interested.

As the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM know, our place upon the ballot is secure for the submission of the amendment at the general election in November, 1936. To accomplish this we had to obtain the signatures of about 111,000 registered voters in the State. This was done with a surplussage of about 25,000, and these signatures have all been passed upon and reported to the Secretary of the State.

It is within the power of the Governor to have the amendment submitted at an earlier special election, but he has no love for it and will take no step which might lead to its speedy adoption. This adoption he has on repeated occasions, as indicated by the newspapers, shown he regards as probable.

First, a word with regard to the progress of organization. The campaign is now, so far as all details of management are concerned, in the hands of two very efficient men. In San Francisco, Mr. Noah D. Alper, No. 83 McAllister St., is in charge, and in Los Angeles, Mr. Franklin Lowney, No. 7619 Wilshire Boulevard.

Mr. Alper is easily one of the most informed, energetic and enthusiastic advocates that could possibly have been named. For his introduction into the campaign we are largely indebted to John Lawrence Monroe. Mr. Lowney, while a newcomer in our ranks, is a man of wide experience in campaign work and with tact and energy. Because of very efficient work on his part in other directions, he was strongly recommended by an old personal friend of mine, Dr. George Winfield Scott of Los Angeles. Mr. Lowney's work is being carried on in connection with a local committee, which includes men of prominence in Los Angeles, like Mr. E. W. Camp,

Dr. Norman Kilbourne, our old friend R. E. Chadwick, and others; the entire number of the committee not yet being complete.

In San Francisco, Mr. Alper is making connections with business men and organizations, as well as with a group of very efficient labor men who are profound believers in the movement. The same is true of Mr. Lowney in Los Angeles.

In San Diego, Mr. E. M. Stangland is actively engaged in letter-writing and appearing before organizations and pressing our proposition with skill and efficiency.

In the central valleys of California our most active representative is George W. Cartwright, of Modesto, who is carrying on extensive letterwriting and arranging to appear before a number of bodies.

I should not omit Mr. Fred W. Workman, of Pacific Grove, who is a tower of strength in his part of the State.

Mrs. Anna George de Mille, now visiting her former State, is rendering every possible assistance.

I have, of course, not enumerated many who are rendering active and energetic assistance but whose responsibility is largely self-imposed while less strenuous than those whose names have been given.

A notable feature of the campaign so far is the large amount of new blood infused into the movement. This was to be expected, because as I have had occasion to say to our friends in several Eastern cities, we do not know the strength of our own cause nor the extent to which it has entered into the public consciousness.

Are we likely to succeed? It is of course, too early, with a sixteen months' campaign ahead of us, to speak with absolute assurance, the more so that we all understand that we have before us an extremely bitter campaign, which will grow the more so as election day approaches. This campaign on the part of our opponents will be financed to an extent with which we cannot hope to compete. All the forces of reaction will be against us. Nevertheless, with justice on our side, for we are told, "Thrice armed is he who hath his quarrel just," we believe we are bound to secure victory.

Will the friends of the movement in the United States back us with their power, which for the most part represents dollars they can give? We believe we have a right to appeal to them if they care as much for the cause as they profess. If they possess sufficient imagination to understand that this means the transfer within a limited period of time, of all taxation upon tangible personal property and improvements to land values, and that this will involve the ultimate transfer of \$100,000,000 a year from privilege to industry—if they believe that such a transfer will by its example and results lead the way for a movement which will extend throughout the United States and even abroad, and that a great blow for freedom will be struck, they will not hesitate to come forward in the most generous manner.

With all this our friends the enemy have done their share to assist us. By imposing recent sales taxes, they have opened the way for us not only to get rid of them—and that is part of our programme—but at the same time to show that all taxation upon tangible personal property and upon improvements is nothing but a sales tax. Thus they have intensified the struggle and put weapons against themselves into our hands.

What will your readers do about it?

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

CHILD labor is but one of the evils resulting from employment of adults with childish ideas as legislators. Just now these legislators think they are helping the child laborers by fussing with a proposed constitutional amendment which leaves fundamental causes alone. An amendment doing away with fundamental evils would be strenuously opposed by them.

Henry George Congress To Meet September 23-25

SINGLE TAXERS from all sections of the United States will assemble in New York City, September 23-25, for the Tenth Annual Henry George Congress, and New York Georgists are already actively at work cooperating with the officers of the Henry George Foundation for the purpose of making this year's convention of the greatest possible practical value to the movement and to all persons participating.

A special effort is being made to secure Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, as one of the principal convention speakers, and if Mr. Hull is able to accept he will likely discuss the tariff question, as the Secretary of State is one of the strongest advocates of the lowering of tariff barriers between nations. As heretofore, some of the outstanding men and women in the Single Tax movement, will address the convention. The speaking programme this year will, however, be greatly curtailed, and those who are to address the convention will be carefully selected with a view to co-ordinating and directing the discussion along channels likely to result in definite contributions to the advancement of the Single Tax movement.

As we go to press, it is too early to make definite announcements as to the details of the convention programme, but among those tentatively listed to address public sessions of the convention are Mayor Wm. N. McNair and Councilman George E. Evans, of Pittsburgh, Congressman Charles R. Eckert, of Pennsylvania, Peter Witt of Cleveland, Mrs. Anna George de Mille and Charles O'Connor Hennessy of New York.

Edmund P. Donovan, of the Henry George New York School, has been appointed Chairman of the Convention Committee, and among those who will serve with him on this committee are Joseph Dana Miller, Leonard T. Recker, Mrs. Anna George de Mille, Miss Charlotte O. Schetter, Mrs. Roswell Skeel, Jr., Frederic C. Leubuscher, Benjamin W. Burger, Mrs. Terese F. Burger, Miss Helen D. Denbigh, Otto K. Dorn, Charles H. Ingersoll, Bolton Hall, Lawson Purdy, Frank Chodorov, Walter Fairchild, Harry Weinberger, Norman C. B. Fowles, John Lawrence Monroe, Clayton J. Ewing, Abe D. Waldauer, Carl D. Smith, John H. Allen, Will Atkinson, Charles G. Baldwin, Harold Sudell, Grace Isabel Colbron, Walter G. Stewart, Otto Cullman, Fenton Lawson, J. C. Lincoln, Dr. Mark Millikin, Harry W. Olney, August Williges, Fiske Warern. Mr. Folke, famous Danish Single Taxer, is coming and there is also a prospect of having Mr. A. W. Madson with us.

As has been the custom, the convention will be in continuous session for a three-day period, opening on Mon-

day morning, September 23. It is planned to devote the first day's session largely to the activities of the Henry George School of Social Science and the Henry George Fellowship, and those active in the School and the Fellowship are working with the convention committee with a view to having a very large representation of the younger element, not only from New York but from various other cities and towns where Extension Classes have been conducted with marked success.

Invitations will go out through the mail to the thousands of active Single Taxers giving further details concerning the programme and other arrangements, and all who plan to participate are urged to make early reservations and cooperate toward making this year's convention one of the best ever held.

The Hotel New Yorker is the place selected for the Conference.

An Appeal to Single Taxers for Action

FROM THE LAND LEAGUE

IT is proposed that we make a determined effort, through petitions to legislators, to vote for taxation of land values, and an intelligent, persistent, and widely supported follow-up of legislators.

The means to accomplish this would consist in a membership large enough to merit the attention of legislators. One legislator would then be requested to introduce a measure, and all legislators would be urgently requested by the full membership, to support such a measure. The League would follow up the voting, and the members would use this information as a guide in the next election.

It is hoped that a nucleus of such an organization can be had among those already converted to Single Tax. This is an appeal to them to register with the League, and to sign and mail application for membership. There are no dues and no obligations beyond the promise of political cooperation. There will be no affiliation with any political party.

Please address the Association as follows:

American Association for Scientific Taxation,
11 Park Place, N. Y., N. Y.

No card will be filed except with the individual envelope in which it was mailed to the League's office. This will certify to the genuineness of the list, and make for effectiveness.

It is hoped that some effective work can be accomplished with an initial membership of present Single Taxers, but it is our purpose to make a drive to enroll the unemployed, the underpaid, the tax victim, and every other citizen who can be made to see that he is a victim of the dumped labor and enforced idleness of land monopoly. It may be possible to do this over the radio, and by any other means the members can suggest. It is felt that a most effective means for enrolling the general public will be the advertising and agitation resulting from the introduction and follow-up of bills in each legislature. There is probably no better inducement to membership in a society than the sight of action, and the opening provided to the individual to take part in action.

Yours for action

COMMITTEE OF THE LAND LEAGUE.

WHEN a government costs thirteen billions a year to maintain and won't even prevent a depression what do we get for our money?

Commencement Dinner of The Henry George School

AN event of great interest to Single Taxers in New York was the Third Commencement Dinner of the Henry George School of Social Science, which was held on Thursday, June 13, at the Town Hall. One hundred and fifteen certificates were issued by the School to those who had completed the course. A large gathering met to welcome the graduates into the Henry George Fellowship, and to hear brief addresses from both old and new friends of the Single Tax. It was a great pleasure to have as guests of honor Mrs. Nina C. Geiger, Dr. George R. Geiger, and his young wife.

Mr. Harry C. Weinberger acted as toastmaster. The first speaker was Mr. Raymond V. McNally, who said that the Henry George School teaches the doctrine of real freedom, not the freedom of the Liberty League. Mr. Harold S. Buttenheim, editor of *The American City*, who has been actively interested in the subject of slum clearance, said that the housing problem will never be solved until the land problem is. "Commodore" Walter Fairchild of the Mahwah River Yacht Club, issued a hearty invitation to all to attend the annual outing there on June 29. Miss Charlotte Schetter spoke briefly, and Miss Helen D. Denbigh reported that the work of the School is now being carried on in classes throughout fourteen States. Dr. George R. Geiger asked to be excused from making a long address, explaining that he was on both a vacation and his honeymoon. He spoke, however, on the need for a popular approach to economics from a new angle; the necessity of getting away from clichés of capitalism, money, etc., and back to the really vital issue, the land question. The majority interpret this literally and narrowly, consider the land question to have reference merely to agriculture, rural communities, the farm, and dismiss the idea glibly as old-fashioned and outmoded. The Henry George School, he said, teaches the true significance of the land question, which, as we know, has a direct and inescapable relation to and influence upon every economic activity of man. His next book, Dr. Geiger said, would probably deal with this topic.

Mr. O. K. Dorn introduced the graduates. First to speak was Miss Sally Kurz. She expressed the regret of all present at the illness of Director Norman C. B. Fowles, which prevented his attending the dinner. She paid tribute to the inspiration and enlightenment his pupils had received from him. The graduates gave a rising vote of thanks for his leadership, and requested that he reconsider his decision to resign as director. Dr. Osias L. Friedman, after voicing his appreciation of the course, remarked that the meeting was too silent. People with a great idea like ours should be seething with the

will to "do something." Miss Pauline Friptu, of Free Acres, N. J., the Single Tax colony founded by Mr. Bolton Hall, said that she became interested in the idea from seeing its practical working out, and finally decided to find out the theory. Mr. Valerian Belinski said that nowhere is there such cohesion between the economic and the moral side of life as is to be found in the teaching of Henry George. Mr. Heman L. Chase recommended that we follow the lead of modern educational practice, and teach people rather than a subject; that we study the individuals to be taught the Single Tax, and start from what they know, making use of the steps in the learning process. We should avoid arguing, but, instead, rise to the dignity of the subject.

During the term a group of young people became so much inspired by the truth of Henry George's teaching that they determined to make themselves more articulate in order better to promulgate it. Under the guidance of Mr. Frank Morgan they pursued a course in public speaking simultaneously with their other studies, and several of their number showed to what good effect their energies had been directed. Among the other speakers were Mr. William Preston, Miss Amelia Romaka, Mr. John B. Maran, Mr. Lancaster Greene, Mr. Walter Gainey, Miss Hilda G. Pollock, Miss Sonia Skutzka, Miss Blanch U. Davis, and Mr. Arthur Vetterman. Mrs. Adeleine Muhlenberg paid glowing tribute to the inspiring teaching of Mr. John Luxton, who conducts classes in Brooklyn. She referred to him as truly a master. Other instructors who received encomiums from their appreciative pupils were Mr. Dorn, Mr. Bell, Mr. Fairchild, Mr. Recker, and Mr. Smith.

The sincerity and enthusiasm of the majority of the people who take the course, and the firmness of their grounding in fundamental economics and in the social philosophy of Henry George, are very encouraging to those interested in the Henry George School. These things, together with a steady increase in the number of pupils each term, bear out the hopes and expectations of the beloved founder, Oscar H. Geiger. Truly it seems that his spirit still guides and strengthens this institution, which promises to rekindle and to spread anew those fires of truth which yet may light the dark places of the world.—MARGARET F. BINGHAM.

School Outing

SATURDAY, June 29, was sultry and hot. People in the city were wiping the beads from their foreheads while collars wilted, but the crowd that gathered at the New York end of the George Washington Bridge was cheerful and gay for they were leaving the city and its hubub for a refreshing ride over the great bridge to Jersey and then up to Suffern, New York, to the home of Walter Fairchild on the banks of the Mahwah River. Not enough privately owned cars were volunteered to carry all that came, so a mammoth bus was chartered that all might ride in comfort; then through that beauti-

ful country-side to the home of our host, nestled in the valley at the foot of the Ramapo Mountains.

STUDENTS OUTNUMBER OLD-TIMERS

The crowd upon arrival seemed so different from the more or less formal one that had left the city. The spirit of youth prevailed and democracy was the order of the day. Shorts, sailor garbs and swim suits took the place of chiffons and flannels. Handball, tennis, canoeing, etc., followed. Lunch was served under a canvass, and "if the proof of the pudding is the eating thereof," then Bob Clancy, Chairman of the Commissary Department, certainly deserves our gratitude for there was nothing left excepting our memory of what we had seen on the table when the dinner bell was first sounded.

SPEECHES!—of course we had speeches,—no Georgist meeting complete without them, but the chairman assured us they would be short and snappy. So we gathered on the lawn and were cooled by soft breezes that were pushing dark storm clouds in our direction at an appalling rate. But fate was kind. The breezes cooled while the dark clouds not only shielded us from the hot sun but also served as a warning to the speakers to make it lively.

Our genial host, Walter Fairchild, greeted the crowd in his usual jovial manner and then presented Mr. Dorn, the chairman who spoke on the opportunities and the work of the Alumni. He then presented several members of the Student-Alumni the first of which was Mr. Charles Erwood who has done such excellent work as Chairman of the Library Committee, who spoke on books for the library. Mr. Norman Fowles, Jr., read an interesting paper by his associate Daniel Alberga, on the graded tax plan, and incidentally mentioned that Mr. Alberga is writing a series of four articles in one of the Brooklyn newspapers on this subject. Miss Denbigh, President of the Student-Alumni Council, spoke most encouragingly on the prospects of the fall term. Her message was inspiring as usual.

Several other friends of the movement spoke, including Mr. Louis Kerwin, who came all the way from Philadelphia to attend the Outing, but the real surprise was occasioned by the appearance of John Lawrence Monroe, Field Director of the School, who reported the progress of the Extension Classes that are being formed and conducted in all parts of the country.

One of the speakers was mystified by the sudden laughter of the audience, until he turned toward the water to see what it was all about. It was this way. Mr. Don Megna and his friend had been quietly cruising near the shore in a canoe which was suddenly capsized. Don and his friend came to the surface O.K., with their clothes clinging tightly to their figures and were safely brought ashore. No casualties reported, and a good laugh was had by all.

Mr. Fowles Retires as Director of the Henry George School

LABORING under the same strenuous load that took his predecessor, the late Oscar H. Geiger, the founder and first director of the Henry George School of Social Science, Mr. Norman C. B. Fowles, also broken in health, has asked to be relieved of the responsibility of the directorship at the close of the Spring semester.

Mr. Fowles is an exceptional teacher. He is especially well informed in economics, also specializing in philosophy, psychology and other subjects. It is sincerely hoped that his recovery will be speedy and permanent. His successor has not yet been found.

Friends of the movement everywhere point with pride to the success of the School and the increase in the number of Extension Classes that have been organized and conducted in all parts of the country. However, the preponderance of the burden of this responsibility has fallen heavily—too heavily—upon the director. In order to enable the incoming director to devote his efforts exclusively to educational matters and to conserve his energies for the more important work

of training an efficient teaching staff, if the School is expected to continue its growth in these proportions, it will be necessary to relieve the head of the School of many of the duties that have heretofore fallen upon his shoulders, by having competent assistants to look after the numerous details and the many problems coincident to the rapid expansion of the School. This, however, will mean a larger staff and incidentally a larger budget.

Will the friends of the movement come forward and underwrite this—the greatest and most effective educational work that has been done in fundamental economics since the days of Henry George? It is this question that is perplexing the trustees of the School at present.

Never before have people been so responsive and so anxious to learn the answer to the economic problem that is baffling the world as now. The depression and the wide-spread poverty on the one hand, and the futile and wasteful efforts of our politicians who are endeavoring to effect recovery without knowing the cause of the depression on the other hand, makes this an opportune time to advance the Georgian idea, which furnishes the only answer to this economic enigma.

Never before have we had in our hands a method by which the work can be taught as effectively and as completely as by the School method, which is not only thorough but also convincing. It brings young men and women into the movement who are not satisfied merely to know the answer, they want action!

This is the opportune moment. The School and the value of the classroom method of teaching "Progress and Poverty" is proven. The results will follow in exact proportion to the number of pupils our means will enable us to enroll.

A Memorable Meeting in Washington

ON Sunday, June 9, the Single Taxers of Washington and nearby towns in Maryland and Virginia, met for their twenty-fourth annual picnic at the home of Mrs. Jessie Lane Keeley in Riverdale, Md., with about fifty present.

The announcement had been broadcast by the hostess that this year the guests were to come unaccompanied by lunches as this was to be her treat in celebration of her retirement about a fortnight before, from Government service, where she had been employed on editorial work in the Department of Labor since 1917.

A bountifully spread table greeted those who came, and after full justice had been done to the tempting array of good things, there followed an impromptu programme, with Mrs. Keeley acting as chairman.

The first speaker, Honorable Charles R. Eckert of Pennsylvania, said that since coming to Congress, he realized more fully than ever before, the difficulties in the way of getting policies and theories of government enacted into law, and urged an attitude of friendliness toward the Administration while pointing out errors in policy and striving to bring to the attention of the President, that more comprehensive subject, the land question. The Supreme Court had done a favor, Mr. Eckert believed, in declaring the NRA unconstitutional. The States have fallen down in the matter of taking charge of those functions which properly come under their jurisdiction, and have failed in the organization and management of the economic problem, and so it was taken up by the Federal Government, and the President, in his effort to correct what should have been done by the States in years gone by, sets up a programme and undertakes to regulate industry, which, under conditions of freedom and justice, natural law could be trusted to govern much better than we could do by making codes. It would be fine if we could get a policy established that would embody the principles of the Single Tax. The task of con-

verting the great body of humanity is beyond our ability; we can make greater headway by concentrating our efforts on those who are in positions of leadership, and we should therefore remain on good terms with the Administration. Attention was called to John Z. White's recent book on "The Basic Functions of Government" which was declared to be of great value to Single Taxers. One of the most promising developments that have taken place along the line of education is the Henry George School of Social Science, whose students are sure to get their economics on straight, and a good percentage of them will probably act as teachers in turn, to spread the gospel to others, and from this way develop a leadership that will eventually carry on the battle to victory, for as Henry George says, "When there is correct thinking, correct action will follow." It is to be hoped that with the confusion and bewilderment existing at present among those in authority, Single Taxers will crystallize and organize their forces and bring pressure to bear upon those who have the power to produce results. We are at the crossroads today and must either go forward to fuller freedom or retreat to greater oppression.

Mrs. Elizabeth M. Phillips, professional dramatic reader and inventor of the "Landlord's Game" for teaching the principles of the Single Tax, expressed hearty agreement with Mr. Eckert's reference to the need of crystallizing and organizing our forces, and declared that the cause stood in need of a systematic publicity campaign of education under the guidance of a first-class organizer. There is now much excellent talent going to waste which might well be utilized to further our cause. It is true our speakers are pretty well organized and used by the Henry George Lecture Bureau, but we have not systematically utilized our letter writers, debaters, broadcasters, actors, readers, story writers, poets, artists, or cartoonists, to say nothing of the hundreds of willing workers scattered throughout the country who only need some plan of action mapped out for them to be of great value to us.

Mr. Walter I. Swanton, who has been faithfully "carrying on" since the loss of Mrs. Swanton, told of his recent trip to New England, where he found unemployment among the "white-collar workers" increasing despite our boasted recovery, and cited a case of three or four hundred men being engaged in writing names on cards for the purpose of keeping them employed, and he thought what a pity it was that their time and energy could not be better used—in working for the Single Tax, for instance. Mr. Swanton urged our cooperation in helping to bring about the California constitutional amendment calling for the repeal of the present odious sales tax and prevention of its reenactment under any guise; the exemption from taxation of improvements to the extent of \$1,000 on homesteads; and the exemption of all personal property in five years, at the rate of twenty per cent each year. This amendment, following a referendum in which the petition received more than 100,000 signatures, will be placed on the ballot in the election of 1936, and with the passage of these four provisions, it is hoped and expected that a new era of prosperity will dawn on this Pacific Coast State of the Golden West.

Mrs. Marie H. Heath, president of the Woman's Single Tax Club of the District of Columbia, seconded Mr. Swanton's plea for help in passing the California amendment, pledged the support of the club in this undertaking, and asked that contributions be brought or mailed to her home, 2801 Adams Mill Road, Apt. 409, Washington, D. C.

Mr. George A. Warren, law editor of the Interior Department, was the next speaker, and no doubt voiced the sentiment of all present when he said that since the NRA road out of the economic depression had to be abandoned, Single Taxers wished with all their heart that the Single Tax road might be chosen, but this was not to be—at least, for the present. Even if the Single Tax were to be enacted into law today, he predicted that the Supreme Court would knock it out, unless perhaps it were passed by an overwhelming majority. The speaker called attention to the fact that the question of whether the Supreme Court should be given the power to declare an Act of Congress unconstitutional, has been turned down three times in the

Constitutional Convention, and no such power is given in the Constitution nor exercised in any other country. Mr. Warren expressed satisfaction in the fact that a very much larger number of Americans were today doing more independent thinking along economic lines than ever before, and declared this boded well, for it had been his observation during a quarter of a century that for one person he had met who knew enough to argue concerning the Single Tax, there were two score that either knew nothing whatever about it, or merely recognized the name and that it was a cause advocated by a man named Henry George—the man the cigar was named after. Mr. Warren believed that Single Taxers could, without abating one jot of their zeal and effort for the Single Tax, lend their support to a number of movements or causes making for human betterment, such as free trade; reform of judicial system; the movement for peace among the nations by ceasing to build great armies and navies, and substituting conference on equal terms; the movement to conserve our natural resources, especially water power, and last but by no means least, everywhere and always championing freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assemblage, and freedom to obtain industrial democracy through collective bargaining.

Brief contributions to the programme were also made by Mr. L. W. Biddle of Takoma Park, Md., and Mr. Francis I. Mooney of Baltimore, Md.—GERTRUDE E. MACKENZIE.

Code for The Agricultural Artel

ADOPTED BY THE SECOND ALL-UNION CONGRESS OF
COLLECTIVE FARM UDARNIKS AND CONFIRMED
BY THE SOVIET OF PEOPLES' COMMISSARS
OF THE USSR, FEB. 17, 1935.

1. PURPOSES AND TASKS

THE working peasants of the villages and country voluntarily unite in the (name) Artel, to construct a collective economy by general means of production and collectively organized labor, to secure full victory over the kulak, over all exploiters and enemies of the toilers of hand or brain, to conquer hunger and darkness, overcome the backwardness of small individual agriculture, create a high productivity of labor, and thus secure a better life for the collective farmers.

The members of the Artel pledge themselves to strengthen their organization, work honestly, divide the collective farm income according to the work done by each member, protect the general property, guard the common good, care well for the tractors, machines and horses, fulfill all duties to the workers and peasants government—and so make this collective farm bolshevist and all collective farmers prosperous.

2. ABOUT THE LAND

All boundary marks, formerly dividing the separate lands of the members of the Artel, are to be abolished, and all lands converted into a single unit, for the collective use of the Artel.

The land occupied by the artel, like all land in the USSR, is the general property, of the people. According to the law of the workers and peasants government, it is placed at the disposal of the artel for perpetual use, forever, and shall not be bought, sold or rented.

The District Executive Committee of the Soviets will give to the artel a government deed for the perpetual use of the land, in which will be established its measurements and exact boundaries. Reduction of the size of this area shall not be permitted, but it may be increased—either by adding to it free land from the government fund or from excess land occupied by individual farmers.

From the land of the Artel there shall be given to each collective farm household for its personal use enough land for a garden or orchard. The size of these household lots, not counting the area under the habitation or buildings, may vary from a half-acre to an acre, and in some districts two acres, according to local conditions, established by the Peoples' Commissars of Agriculture of the republics.

It is forbidden to separate from the artel the lands of members leaving the collective farm. Those who leave the artel may receive land only from the free lands of the government fund.

The lands of the artel will be divided into fields according to the approved sequence of grain cultivation. Each field working brigade shall be given a permanent part of the land as its responsibility during the whole cycle of cultivation.

3. ABOUT THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION

The following shall be general property:

All working animals, cultivating equipment (plows, seeding machines, cultivators, thrashing machines, harvesters) seed stocks, enough feed for the collective farm cattle, general farm buildings, and all equipment for handling the collective farm products.

The following remain in individual use:

All dwellings, personal cattle and fowls, and such buildings as are needed for the cattle belonging to individual households. Also all small tools and equipment needed for the work of the individual household land allotments.

From the general working cattle the directors of the artel may set aside some horses for the service of the individual members, for pay.

Then follow other sections which give the rules for the management of the artel, the organization of its work, and other matters.

None of the rules make any mention of the ownership or control of clothing, household tools, utensils or other individual property, nor of children or other family matters. The reason these are not mentioned is that, contrary to some popular notions in America, all these things remain the private property and personal affair of individuals in the USSR.—A. H. JENKINS.

Opinion Makers in Our Day

ONE of the most significant facts that a student of these troubled times in the United States must observe, is that a great many of the public commentators upon social and economical affairs are expositors of some more or less nebulous Socialist or Communist philosophy, which demands vital changes in the existing order of things.

A writer in a recent issue of *Unity* (edited by Dr. John Haynes Holmes), declares that the small group of Union Square agitators who, in pre-depression days, were "distinguished by their preference for soiled linen and their pent-up hatred of the capitalist system," have now had their numbers greatly augmented by many more or less distinguished persons, mostly from the literary craft. The *Unity* writer proceeds to mention only a few of the "converts to the religion of Marx" who are now, it seems, enlisted for some sort of a revolution in this country. Among these are Edmund Wilson, Newton Arvin, Malcolm Cowley and Granville Hicks. He might, I think, have added Heyward Brown, Walter Lippmann, Stuart Chase and most of the editors of *Unity*, as well as of *The Nation*, *The New Republic*, and of the very influential *Christian Century*.

Indeed, I think one might fairly be able to include among the left wingers a few of the noted book reviewers of our metropolitan press, not to mention a raft of young college professors and some of the noted religious preachers of the day.

The sincerity and good faith of these gentlemen seem to me to be beyond question. Most of them are ardent

idealists not afraid of being classed as radicals, but the pity of it is, as it seems to me, that they are not radical at all, because of their seeming inability to perceive the root of things in their desire for the social and economic regeneration of a very sick world.

For the edification of the readers of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, I would like from time to time to submit and comment upon samples of the outgivings of some of these "opinion-makers."

* * *

Just now I must content myself with offering a few observations about Rexford Guy Tugwell, one-time Columbia professor, now Under Secretary of Agriculture, and reputed Brain Truster Number One. There is considerable evidence that because of his influence in guiding vital public policies at Washington, he is perhaps the most important opinion maker in the United States. He seems to be able to make many of the opinions of President Roosevelt.

Life in a recent lively description of Prof. Tugwell by Drew Pearsons said this:

"No man in the New Deal today yields so much indirect power, commands so much newsprint, sits so near the top of the heap save the New Dealer himself. . . . His remedy is national, planning not through dictatorial decree, but by evolutionary experimentation. Tugwell remains the only member of the original Brain Trust, still active, still forceful, still near the throne."

In that much talked of book "The New Dealers," interestingly describing in a friendly spirit the chief personalities of Mr. Roosevelt's Administration, Mr. Tugwell is referred to as "its principal economic philosopher," and further we are told "When you reach Tugwell you come close to the heart of the New Deal."

It is intimated in this seemingly inspired story of the New Dealers that to Tugwell, rather than to his chief Secretary Wallace, is due the application of a "planned economy" for the American farmer by the process of subsidizing him with public funds to limit the produce of his land. This process is called "social control." Perhaps it was the hurt pride of authorship that led the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in a radio address not long ago, to be so angered with critics of the AAA as to refer to them as "Tory obscurantists," and to their criticism as "infantile, obscene, and wicked."

I wish there were space for me to deal with a few samples of Dr. Tugwell's opinions on economic subjects, which, if I could quote them, might leave the reader of ordinary intelligence like myself in a maze of confusion and obfuscation. Those readers who were wise enough to keep a file of *LAND AND FREEDOM* may remember (May-June, 1933 issue), the devastating exposure of Dr. Tugwell's mental processes made in an extended review by Joseph Dana Miller of "The Industrial Discipline and Governmental Arts," a much advertised book of last year. Although very courteously performed, Mr. Miller's revela-

tion in that review of the vague, superficial and confused thinking of the professor, must to those who read it, have seemed entirely conclusive. My own reading of some of the essays of Dr. Tugwell leaves me without understanding why this gentleman has attained the eminence and influence that is his in the affairs of the nation.

So far as one may be able to discover any guiding economic principle of importance that Dr. Tugwell seeks to follow and to impress upon the people of the United States, it is the Socialist concept of "a planned economy," to be attained by experimentation. Mark Sullivan truly observes in a recent article that a planned economy is a dictated economy and that dictation in the end can only make itself felt by imposing jail imprisonment or economic ruin upon those who will not submit to it.

It was with Tugwell in his eye, perhaps, that Al Smith (before he was induced to retire from editorship and become a good boy), said something to the effect that experiment was being substituted for experience in the seat of government. And the *Sphere* only recently said, referring directly to Dr. Tugwell:

"It is a pity of course, that the experimental ground for academic enthusiasm should have been or is the nation's economy."

This is enough about Dr. Tugwell.

The next time I write, I would like to say things about the opinions and the influence of Lippman and Broun, each of whom, through wide syndication of their writings, has an immense audience.—JOHN COLLINS.

Exchange

MANY people seem to think that the exchange payable when money is sent from one country to another, is a burden placed on the operation by banks and financiers for their own profit. Exchange would exist and rise and fall if there were no banks and financiers, though no doubt those agencies speculate in exchange and sometimes win and sometimes lose. Suppose Brown in Australia has a profitable milk run, and saves £1,000 which he wants to send to America for a piano and a motor car. He cannot send Australian money, so he goes to Smith who has wool or butter and asks him to sell him enough of those products to enable him to get the American goods he desires. Smith knows how much Australian money he will get in exchange for the bank draught he receives when his wool or butter is sold in London or New York, and he will charge Brown accordingly. If Smith says "Glad to oblige you, old chap, I don't want any profit," that is the lowest rate of exchange possible. But if there are dozens of people who want to import goods but have no Australian goods to export, and are all approaching Smith for accommodation, exchange will naturally rise. The higher it rises the better for exporters, and the more the Browns will

have to pay. But this does not necessarily mean that the Smiths will be better off than the Browns or that it would be more profitable for them to give up their milk run and go in for producing butter or wool; though rising exchange will always be one factor in encouraging people to produce exportable goods. The only way to reduce the rate of exchange is to produce plenty of exportable goods. A general attempt to do so will surely be met by a rise in the price of land on which the exportable goods must be produced, also tariffs on machinery and stores used in the production of the exportable goods will, by enhancing the cost of their production, increase the difficulty of placing them on the market of the world.

It must be noted that although Brown does his business through a bank, the effect is the same, and he does it in that way because the bank charge is less than the bother of hunting up a Smith and dealing with him.

E. I. S. H.

Miscellany

TAXPAYERS MUST GIVE HARDOONS \$337,720 FOR ONE-SIXTH-ACRE

The decision of the land commission of the Municipal Council to give Mrs. Liza Hardoon the sum of Tls. 337,720, equivalent to about \$130,000 in U. S. currency for slightly over one-sixth of an acre of land on Nanking Road for street-widening purposes accords strictly with the principles of Anglo-Saxon law with respect to the acquisition of private land for public purposes. But even though it accords with legal principles there will be many foreigners and Chinese, land owners as well as non-land owners, who will not relish the idea of digging down into their pockets in these difficult times to pay their portion of this considerable sum of money. According to the evidence brought out at the hearing, S. A. Hardoon purchased the property in 1919 at a rate of approximately Tls. 60,000 for one-sixth of an acre, amounting to about \$80,000 in U. S. currency, according to the high silver exchange rate prevailing at that time.

S. A. Hardoon came to Shanghai many years ago by the Bagdad-Indian route and every dollar he acquired in real estate transactions he invested in Nanking Road property—to such an extent that he became the largest owner of frontage on both sides of Shanghai's chief retail street. The buildings he constructed were jerry-built of cheap mud-bricks and plaster, often of such inferior materials that sections frequently fell into the street, endangering the safety of pedestrians. Under the antiquated system of taxation that prevails in Shanghai, the shop-keepers who rented the buildings had to pay the taxes. Therefore, all Landlord Hardoon had to do was sit back and collect his rent, which he steadily increased as the leases expired. Hardoon spent little or nothing to improve his property and if a tenant required a new front window or other improvement, the tenant had to spend the money himself. As Shanghai grew and the crowds became denser and denser on Nanking Road, Hardoon became richer and richer, until at the time of his death a few years ago he was worth well over \$50,000,000. All of his wealth went to his widow, a woman of Chinese nationality, who lives in seclusion in the large estate surrounded by a high brick wall on Bubbling Well Road. Soon after his death several relatives from the protectorate of Iraq turned up in Shanghai to claim a portion of the estate, but the British court refused to entertain their claims. When Hardoon died he was land-poor, meaning that there were no liquid assets available to pay the British inheritance tax, in consequence of which it became necessary for the estate to float a bond issue to pay the taxes.

For many years Hardoon constituted the largest single handicap

to the improvement of what should have become one of the best retail streets in the world, comparable at least to the Ginza in Tokyo. His refusal to improve his property resulted in Nanking Road being a street of cheap, insanitary shacks, many of them unsuited for occupancy and unfit for human habitation. Today, owing to the economic depression and the falling off of tourist trade, few of the retailers on Nanking Road are able to sell sufficient merchandise to pay their rents, but there has been no tendency to reduce rentals. Hardoon contributed little to charity throughout his long career, and while he received the best possible protection under British extraterritorial jurisdiction he paid no taxes to the British treasury, at least not until after he was dead, and since his property was located within the Foreign Settlement he likewise paid no taxes to the Chinese Government. The attorneys for the Hardoon estate, in the recent hearing demanded \$564,108.97 for the narrow strip of property which the city required for widening the street. The award of Tls. 337,720 which the estate received accords strictly with accepted legal conceptions, but as stated in the foregoing, the decision of the land commission will bring little joy to Shanghai's now sorely-harassed taxpayers.

China Weekly Review.

HOW WE STRANGLE TRADE

On Thursday, before the millionth bale left the port on a departing steamer, Houston had exported 989,566 bales of cotton this season. At the same time last year exports totaled 1,989,001 bales. The port was reaching the second million in exports instead of the first.

It is not difficult to understand what this terrific loss in tonnage means to the port. It does not require a statistician to compute the slump in employment resulting from loss of markets for a million bales of cotton in a single year or the monetary losses involved.

The loss of more than half of our cotton export business is the most serious problem confronting Houston as a port. This threat to an industry which has a huge investment in this city and provides employment for literally thousands of persons is serious enough to challenge the interest of every Houstonian.—*Houston Post.*

FRANCE AND BELGIUM

Terre et Liberte (18 Ave. de la Criolla, Suresnes, Seine, and 7 Ave. Wolvendael, Uccle-les-Bruxelles) for January-March, 1935, is largely a "Spanish" number. Much care is given to study of the Socialist land laws, which were a large factor in the anti-Socialist reaction of today, including as they did many proposals of which Georgists could not approve. A table shows that of five millions of agriculturists there are two millions of paupers or proletarians with no land; and a quarter million poor peasants with an average holding of one acre; one million small owners with an average of twelve acres; 700,000 more comfortable with an average of fifty acres; while 50,000 large owners have more than 1,200 acres, of whom the really important are a mere handful. One per cent of the population "own" fifty-one per cent of the country; while there are in the Estremadura alone 35,000 "Junteros," idle, "capitalist laborers," with a plough team of their own, offering to work land on shares. The plans to buy estates above a certain *area* (often below a standard of cultivation) and let them in small equal holdings to unemployed are very costly and unlikely to give any lasting result—certainly as compared with transfer of tax burdens to site value as demanded by an increasing number of civic bodies. The review also contains an incisive article by Mr. Sam Meyer on "Planning and Liberty" and a comparison of the Land Laws of Solon with the proposals of Henry George by Mr. P. Gianellia.—M. J. S. in London *Land and Liberty.*

CHILE MOVES IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

Some fifty years ago, while employed as a gas inspector for his city, Henry George wrote his brilliant book, "Progress and Poverty." His contention was a single tax on land exclusively would be a panacea

for the economic ills of society. His theory caused an intellectual furor. Big business was forced to try and answer it with a book called "Progress and Prosperity."

Perhaps the only place where his theory is even being partially applied today is in Pittsburgh, the home of the rich Mellon family. That city's first Democratic mayor in twenty years, William N. McNair, is a George disciple. Under his administration there is a higher tax on land than on its improvements.

Seemingly Chile is applying his theory. But the facts are otherwise. That country has adopted a law that all new buildings erected during the four years ending December 31 next will be exempted from all taxation for ten years.

The measure is to give relief to thousands of idle men and business houses, thus restoring prosperity. This objective has been attained.

Thousands of homes, stores and business blocks have been constructed all over the country. Millions of dollars have been distributed in buying building material and paying wages. The banks co-operated by making loans at a low interest rate.

—SAM EWING, columnist in *San Francisco News*.

KIDDING THEMSELVES

A Stockton man was heard the other day to say that he does not care how many taxes are piled on his business, providing he can pass them along to the customer.

Men who talk like this are just "kidding themselves."

Taxes that are passed on always bound back!

Business has to be produced. It does not produce itself.

Unless men are producing, there is no business; and there can be business only in proportion to our production.

Men who talk as this man does are forgetting that the money that goes for taxes does not produce.

The men employed as assessors, tax-collectors, tax auditors, tax investigators, tax spies and spies spying on all these are not producing!

At that time, energy, money and ability is lost from production.

This is so because taxation does not produce—it must, instead, be assumed as so much added dead load, so much more friction, so much lost motion.

Business men should look upon a tax, even one that can be passed on to the customer, as a direct loss.

No one makes anything collecting taxes for a government; for, even if it were always collected, and even if it cost nothing to keep books and remit the taxes to the authorities, the business man makes nothing by this labor.

Often he is out money by failure or inability to collect.

And, in any event, the buying power of his customers is reduced in exact proportion to the taxes they pay.

The gasoline tax averages over forty per cent of the price of the gasoline. This tax of forty per cent means that the buying power of automobilists is cut down forty per cent. If automobilists can not or will not economize on mileage, their purchasing power in other fields is cut down accordingly. In that case they buy fewer clothes or spend less with the grocer—or let the doctor or the lawyer or the dentist take that loss.—*The Forum*, Stockton, Calif.

ONE MAN'S OPINION

Here is something that I have had in mind for years. Indeed, I mentioned the idea variously in several connections through the last decade. Brother economist writes in part:

"I believe that we Henry George fellows should all migrate to some one State and there try to enact and establish those economic principles and proposals of freedom and justice which we advocate by our own majority there.

"Let the Socialists and Communists—those Marx-maddened minions—go to any State by themselves as a majority there also; then let the rightness of our Henry George philosophy be demon-

strated by results. Then the exact science of economic principles would be shown as a fact and that would be of inestimable value. Yours for justice, Waldo J. Wernicke, Los Angeles."

—Editorial *Los Angeles Post Record*.

A THOUGHTFUL COMMENT

A mode of thinking that regards the very structure of society as a wicked or vicious contrivance put together and maintained by the malevolence of nature or the wickedness of certain selfish men and fails to take into account the long development of society, leading to its present organic structure, cannot be expected to discover the nature of its present maladjustments or to promote effective means for the setting right of its present functional derangements.

I believe that our social organization, like our individual bodies, is endowed by its long inheritance with a marvellous and beautiful organic structure that is fully capable, so far as structure is concerned, of performing every function of which the organism as a whole has need, and, again, like the individual body, it is subject to functional disorders which put its various parts in great need of readjustment one to another and to the whole, rather than any destruction or general reconstruction. With readjustments, the evolution and organic growth of society will continue, but this can be only by the method which nature employs in all those forms or organization which survive, and that is not by discarding existing structures and forms, but by combining them into ever higher and more complex relationships out of which new functions and new attainments emerge. This is known as Emergent Evolution. It is perhaps the deepest conception and the most significant intellectual development of the present age.—SPENCER HEATH.

OF WHOM DOES THIS REMIND YOU?

Both brilliant and brittle, both bold and unstable,
Indecisive, yet keen, Alfred Vargrave seemed able
To dazzle but not to illumine mankind.
A vigorous, various, versatile mind;
A character wavering, fitful, uncertain,
Like a shadow that shakes o'er a luminous curtain—
Vague, flitting, but on it forever impressing
The shape of some substance at which you stand guessing.
When you said: "All is worthless and weak here," behold
Into sight on a sudden there seemed to unfold
Great outlines of strenuous truth in the man.
When you said "This is genius," the outlines grew wan,
And his life, though in all things so gifted and skilled,
Was at best but a promise which nothing fulfilled.

—From OWEN MEREDITH's "Lucile."

SINGLE TAXERS' SHOWING AT TRENTON

Ever since George L. Record's days the Legislature, almost every year, has been asked to act on a bill that would, if enacted into law, carry out gradually the Henry George Single Tax idea by providing for the gradual shifting of the tax from homes and buildings and improvements on the land.

Each time the bill has been beaten more or less decisively. This week the proposal, sponsored by Assemblymen Fred Von Nieda of Camden, Republican, and Theron McCampbell of Monmouth, Democrat, was given 21 votes to 37 cast in opposition.

The bulk of the favorable vote came from Essex, whose representatives so voted largely as a compliment to Alfred Chandler of Newark, one of the chief apostles of the Henry George doctrine. There was also the influence of William H. Seely, chairman of the Essex Clean Government League, who is a Single Taxer and holds that the taxes ought to be levied on the land and not on the handiwork of man.

The late Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, former Senator Charles

O'Connor Hennessy, formerly of Bergen, former Assemblyman James G. Blauvelt of Ridgewood, the late Supreme Court Justice James F. Minturn, Frank Sommer, Republican State Committeeman Everett Colby, Charles Ingersoll, former Mayor Mark M. Fagan and J. Owen Grundy have all been classed as advocates of the Henry George doctrine, but as a rule this doctrine is not much on parade except at banquets to the memory of Henry George or on other occasions where the job of translating words into action is not directly involved.

The vote for the Henry George bill this week in Trenton was larger than had been anticipated. At a time when land is bearing such a heavy tax burden it was feared by the Single Taxers that few assemblymen would care to vote for a proposal to shift taxes from buildings to the land, especially if the members were not fully versed in all phases of the Henry George gospel.—*Jersey Journal*, June 28.

UNEARNED INCOMES

In an off-hand, impromptu fashion, privilege may be defined as the legally protected right to a flow of income and benefits from legally recognized and protected property rights. Privileges may be earned, such as the income derived from funds which the recipient himself has earned and saved; privileges often are entirely unearned, such as the income derived from inheritances of a vast nature, unearned income in site value in city land (community created wealth) or natural resources. Nature gave man a great abundance of natural resources free and man has been attempting to correct that oversight ever since by charging mankind plenty for these useful, indispensable natural resources. Unearned income derived from inheritance, natural resources, site value, and other unearned sources, as monopoly franchises, may be regarded as unearned privileges divorced from the performance of necessary economic functions. Abraham Lincoln once defined the parasitic privileged class as those who live by owning rather than by doing.

PROF. JOSEPH M. KLAMON in *St. Louis Star-Times*.

TIME TO CHANGE OUR POLICY

No specious reasoning or trick logic can alter the obvious and indisputable facts. There is something vital and significant to be found in the unanimity of agreement among all recognized authorities in the realm of political economy, to the effect that any tax levied upon the products of industry inevitably sifts down to the backs of the industrious, where it adds to an already too burdensome load.

The tax condition has become a serious one. This is not more true in one State than another, though there are variations in the kinds of taxes levied and the methods of collecting them. Evidently the same general errors are being made everywhere and the results are uniformly unfortunate. Why not then turn away from the common practices which have proven themselves so ill-advised, have produced such tragic results and give no promise whatever of doing better in the future? Even those in high places who feel impelled to say that perhaps we must, after all, have a sales tax of some sort, do so with apparent reluctance and with the accompanying denial of any sympathy with the principle of the tax.

Must we have more of the sort of taxes which have proven so disastrous and inequitable? If we wish to destroy commerce and industry altogether it can be done with taxation, unless the people, the service-rendering manufacturers and merchants and their co-operating employes demand in no uncertain terms the full enjoyment of their right to freely render their good services without being hampered or their legitimate interests impaired by a sales tax.

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY in *West Coast Trade Journal*.

LAND IS FOR USE NOT SPECULATION

If the people of Cordele want to improve living conditions in this republic they should bestir themselves.

Prosperity has been "just around the corner" since the days of

Hoover and we don't yet know which corner or what way it is going or if it is going at all.

And even if we got it who wants a partial make-believe thing like what we called prosperity?

What we had was not secure and was for a few only. Why not have a civilization in which all can prosper?

Unless you do it is a pseudo or false civilization or prosperity. So far as I know the present authorities of Cordele are doing as well with the means at hand as any one else could do, but I think we should change our plans.

This town could have an immense influence and when and if joined by some more could accomplish wonders.

The main thing we need to learn is to use the land instead of speculating in it. To stop the private appropriation of the rental values and use them for the public good.

When you do that we could have some worth-while improvements not now attainable and also get relief from all kinds of taxation.

To mention only one of a long list of benefits our merchants could and would carry larger and better stocks of goods and sell them cheaper if they were relieved of ad valorem taxation on same.

Just about anybody who wanted a home could and would build one.

Do you, Mr. Editor, or any of your readers know the limit of achievement for law and order and science? I do not.

HOWELL CLOPTON HARRIS, in *Cordele*, (Ga.) *News*.

WAIL OF A PROTECTED MANUFACTURER

I am a manufacturer, and was a petitioner for the act to encourage and protect the manufacturers of this State. I was very happy when the act was obtained, and I immediately added to the price of my manufacturers as much as it would bear, so as to be a little cheaper than the same articles imported in paying the duty. By this addition I hoped to grow richer. But, as every manufacturer whose wares are under Protection has done the same, I begin to doubt whether, considering the whole year's experiences of my family, with all these separate additions which I pay to other manufacturers, I am at all a gainer. And I confess I cannot but wish that, except the Protection duty on my own manufacture, all duties of the kind were taken off and abolished.—BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

NO RADICAL

One of the ironies of life is how Henry George is regarded as a radical, and how when Single Taxers are mentioned in modern times the hearer inevitably brackets them with Socialists.

The day may come, what with share-the-wealth taxing programmes, and soak the rich schemes, and nationalization of banking ideas, and the public ownership of utilities, when the forces of capitalism will need a real defender against the assaults of collectivism, and Henry George, if he hadn't fallen into disrepute, would have been that defender.

For never in the history of economic writing has such an iron-bound unbreakable, absolutely complete and untouchable defense of the rights and the real necessity of capitalism been written as George provided in his great work, "Progress and Poverty."

Never has a champion of individual freedom, of rugged individualism, of the right of every man to the product of his own toil, the right of every man to rule his destiny as he sees fit, spoken so clearly and emphatically.

George's particular antipathy was monopoly, and his thesis was that monopoly was impossible save where someone obtained control of a natural agent of production—a natural agent being some object which man could not duplicate with his own toil, such as land, water power, mines, and so on.

He was violently opposed to any tax whatever on industry, on the improvements which men made to lands, on buildings, on income. He asked only that men pay for the use of natural agents the proper

or social value of those natural agents; and he contended if that were done not only would the legitimate expenses of government be met, but there would be no need of such regulatory devices as NRA and, the rest of the alphabetical soup; depressions would be less serious, for there would be no misery and unemployment, and capitalism could go on in its function of increasing the divisible supply of wealth to infinity, for it would always have a market. There would be nothing taken out of production for taxes, consequently the buying power of the public would be infinitely increased.

Capitalists, however, who want in these days of doubt and distrust to justify their position in a logically unassailable manner, who want the classic defenses of interest and profits, should read George.

Editorial *Daily Idaho Statesman*, Boise, Idaho.

THE REDUCTION TO SLAVERY

In seeking to deny them the right to sell timber from land purchased from the State until the land is paid for in full, it would seem that the governor and attorney general are not so much concerned with stopping land speculation as they are in reducing the purchasers of State land to a basis of slavery by making it impossible to use the land as best suits their purposes.

In this connection it will be recalled that last year the governor and attorney general, as members of the State Land Commission, would have disposed of the price of leases in Mississippi, at a mere fraction of its value to Uncle Andy Mellon's company, which owns millions of acres in Mississippi, had not R. D. Moore, State Land Commissioner, and third member of the land commission, refused to consent to such outrageous transaction.

Jeffersonian Democrat, Jackson, Miss.

KARL B. MICKEY SPANKS THE CLEVELAND PRESS

To the Editor:

In your editorial on the President's tax message you conclude with the assertion that "with the general philosophy set forth there can be, in our opinion, little for any fair-minded citizen to challenge." It seems to me a new idea of fairness, to impute in advance unfairness to anyone so brash as to disagree with you. Despite my natural trepidation under the circumstances, I shall brave the imputation.

To avoid the charge of misrepresenting the President, I shall in each case set down the verbatim quotation from the address before my comment on it.

"The movement toward progressive taxation of wealth and of income has accompanied the growing diversification and inter-relationship of effort which marks our industrial society."

In other words, as the arts of production and exchange have improved, government has tried to discourage the improvement by progressively fining the improvers.

"Wealth in the modern world does not come merely from individual effort; it results from a combination of individual effort and of the manifold uses to which the community puts that effort."

Mr. Roosevelt ought to tell us what he means by "wealth;" he doesn't use it in the sense of any coherent definition I have ever run across. Wealth, as defined by reputable economists, is, and must be, the product of the individual; and that fact is not altered by co-operation, voluntary or involuntary, between individuals. What he means by "a combination of individual effort and of the manifold uses to which the community puts that effort," stumps me entirely.

"In the last analysis such accumulations (of wealth) amount to the perpetuation of great and undesirable concentration of control in a relatively few individuals over the employment and welfare of many, many others."

How in the name of common sense can wealth perpetuate concentration of control? Wealth can't even perpetuate itself. Wealth is the most transient, ephemeral thing in the world. It is continuously being diminished by deterioration, rust, decay, and obsolescence. In the form of consumption goods it is constantly being destroyed by consumption; in the form of capital goods, by use. Something en-

tirely different gives the few the power of economic tyranny over the many; something which Mr. Roosevelt mentions in a later paragraph.

"A tax upon inherited wealth is a tax upon static wealth, not upon that dynamic wealth which makes for the healthy diffusion of economic good."

I quote this sentence for comic relief. I can imagine no more sile-splitting spectacle than that of Mr. Roosevelt attempting to define what he means by "static wealth" and "dynamic wealth."

"People know that vast personal incomes come not only through the effort or ability or luck of those who receive them, but also because of the opportunities for advantage which Government itself contributes."

Now the cat is out of the bag. The power of economic tyranny is never due to productive effort and the possession of wealth, but always to opportunities for advantage which Government sets up by legislative enactment to rob the people of their heritage. In other words, the economic bondage of the people is not due to wealth, but to the malfeasance of their own Government.

Isn't the remedy, then, to stamp out the unjust advantage which Government gives to a few men over their fellows? How can the President talk of "social justice" while complacently permitting the existence of this condition to go unchallenged? If Mr. Roosevelt sincerely wishes to kill this evil, he will ask Congress to abolish governmental interference with equality of economic opportunity, instead of indiscriminately to tax wealth regardless of whether it is legitimately or illegitimately acquired. He will strike at the root, instead of hacking at the branches.

I submit this for publication on the assumption that there still is sufficient freedom left to permit a humble subject to utter a word of respectful criticism of his masters.—KARL B. MICKEY.

DEBTS MAKE TAXES

Not so long ago a national debt of \$1,000,000,000 was regarded as being dangerous. Today we are asked to look with equanimity on a debt of \$35,000,000,000.

Nobody knows where the money is coming from. Nobody has been told. We all know that payment must be made some time or other out of taxes. Taxes today are estimated to be twenty-five per cent of the national income. If increased incomes come with prosperity, such increased incomes will be of no benefit to the people—the increase will be eaten up in added taxes.

What incentive is there to increased business if every citizen knows that the reward for his effort will be taken away from him? Unless taxes go down there can be no sound prosperity. If they do go down, prosperity will come of its own accord.—*Public Service Magazine*.

NEW DEAL AND OLD DEAL POLICIES

Mr. Ogden L. Mills is the greatest opponent of New Deal fallacies and the greatest exponent of old deal fallacies. His statement "that employees' share of the national income had increased steadily until the depression began in 1929" must be examined not only as to the total amount paid employees but rather the relation of the increased amount of wages paid to the increased amount of wealth produced. Also bearing in mind that a wage is what a wage will buy.

Mr. Mills claims the World War was "the fundamental cause of the depression." The war may have hastened it, or contributed to its depth of duration. Monopoly of the natural resources and speculation in securities, the values of which are based on the natural resources, cause all booms, panics and depressions.

JOHN J. EGAN in *World-Telegram*.

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Politics is the science of equity, and treats of the relations of men in equity. It professes to develop the laws by which human actions ought to be regulated, in so far as men interfere with each other.

In position it is posterior to political economy and anterior to re-

ligion. Its principal substances are Man, Will, Action, Duty, Crime, Rights, Wrongs, and Property; and the general problem is to discover the laws which should regulate the voluntary actions of men towards each other, and thereby determine what the order of society in its practical construction and arrangement ought to be. * * * And as there cannot be the slightest doubt that God has made truth the fountain of good, it may perhaps be fairly expected that, if ever political science is fairly evolved and really reduced to practice, it will confer a greater benefit on mankind and prevent a greater amount of evil than all the other sciences."—From "The Theory of Human Progression," by PATRICK EDWARD DOVE.

WHAT GOVERNMENT COSTS US

Expenditures of government from Washington to Wilson, 1789-1913, total of 124 years—\$24,521,845,000.

Expenditures of Roosevelt administration as estimated by the President—actual 1934 and estimated 1935 and 1936, total of three years—\$24,206,533,000.

Wingold News Letter, Bay State Milling Co., Winona, Minn.

NOW, however, we are coming into collision with facts which there can be no mistaking. From all parts of the civilized world come complaints of industrial depression; of labor condemned to involuntary idleness; of capital massed and wasting; of pecuniary distress among business men; of want and suffering and anxiety among the working classes. All the dull, deadening pain, all the keen, maddening anguish, that to great masses of men are involved in the words "hard times," afflict the world today.—"PROGRESS AND POVERTY."

THE Irish famine was not a true famine arising from scarcity of food. It was what an English writer styled the Indian famine—a "financial famine," arising not from scarcity of food but from the poverty of the people.—"THE LAND QUESTION."

THOSE who say it would be unjust for the people to resume their natural rights in the land without compensating present holders, confound right and wrong as flagrantly as did they who held it a crime in the slave to run away without first paying his owner his market value.—"PROPERTY IN LAND."

ONE thing or the other must be true—either protection does give better opportunities to labor and raises wages, or it does not. If it does, we who feel that labor has not its rightful opportunities and does not get its fair wages should know it, that we may unite, not merely in sustaining present protection, but in demanding far more. If it does not, then, even if not positively harmful to the working classes, protection is a delusion and a snare, which distracts attention and divides strength, and the quicker it is seen that tariffs cannot raise wages the quicker are those who wish to raise wages likely to find out what can. The next thing to knowing how anything can be done, is to know how it cannot be done.—"PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE."

FOR it is of the very nature of injustice that it really profits no one. When and where was slavery good for slaveholders? Did her cruelties in America, her expulsions of Moors and Jews, her burnings of heretics, profit Spain? Has England gained by her injustice toward Ireland? Did not the curse of an unjust social system rest on Louis XIV and Louis XV as well as on the poorest peasant whom it condemned to rags and starvation—as well as on that Louis whom it sent to the block? Is the Czar of Russia to be envied?—"THE LAND QUESTION."

THERE is distress where large standing armies are maintained, but there is also distress where the standing armies are nominal; there is distress where protective tariffs stupidly and wastefully hamper trade, but there is also distress where trade is nearly free;

there is distress where autocratic government yet prevails, but there is also distress where political power is wholly in the hands of the people in countries where paper is money, and in countries where gold and silver are the only currency. Evidently, beneath all such things as these, we must infer a common cause.—"PROGRESS AND POVERTY."

BOOK REVIEWS

THE STAGNATION OF INDUSTRY ITS CAUSE AND CURE

EMIL O. JORGENSEN

ANY reader of this courageous book who accepts the fundamentals of George's teaching fully is likely to be completely bewildered by the first three chapters, but will experience an intense satisfaction from there on to the very end.

In the first three chapters the discussion of Rent and Price is such as to make this reviewer doubtful as to whether the subject matter can ever possibly be made entirely clear to anyone who does not accept the assumption that "rent enters into price." In the effort to add something constructive to this discussion, the chapter beginning with the fourth will be considered first and the Rent and Price question later.

In Chapter IV, the author comes into perfect agreement with George on "The Remedy." In it he deals with rent as a "socially created value" in a manner that may leave the thoughtful reader wondering how the proposition concerning Rent and Price set up earlier, ever came about. The justifications for the remedy (the Single Tax) are admirably set forth. The wastefulness of the rent-receiving class is emphasized in a way that leaves nothing to be desired. It is a fine point, forcefully stated.

"Incidental effects of the remedy" are presented in a manner that shows what the author can do when he is on firm ground.

"Civilization at the crossroads" is a picture that should be placed before all men in high place in the vague hope that they could be made to realize the dark problems they face.

In Part II, "The Application of the Single Tax," the author gives his opinion of "how and where to begin." Perhaps this is correct for Chicago, to which it refers, but will remain a matter of opinion as to other places.

Part III really supplements the benevolent effects of the remedy, previously referred to, under the caption, "The Benefits of the Proposed Bills," as applied to bills discussed in Part II for Chicago. All the subject matter is splendidly described and applies equally well everywhere. Most of those familiar with their George are naturally well acquainted with this content but it has rarely been presented so interestingly, accompanied by charts, tables and graphs, for which all who are interested in elucidating George's views will undoubtedly be grateful to the author's industry. For carrying conviction to the popular mind, these passages can not be praised too highly.

Appreciation and description of the above must be curtailed, however, in view of the limited space and importance of the subject, while the first three chapters which deal with Rent and Price are considered. Here is attempted a serious breach in the defenses of the whole George philosophy. Concede that George did not understand "Rent" in all of its ramifications and it at once appears that thousands of serious-minded thinkers wasted their time and, what is worse, their enthusiasm for making this world happier for the human race. If George's understanding and reasoning are incorrect how can the "Remedy" based on his diagnosis effect a cure?

In connection with this disagreement about rent entering or not into price, why has not the author, who is now repeating what he has said before, taken advantage of his opportunity to answer his critics? In the Sept.-Oct., 1931 issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, the late Oscar H. Geiger reviewed "The Road to Better Business and Plentiful Employment" by the same author. Mr. Geiger, whose qualifications for such discussion none dispute, laid out some funda-

mental facts and deductions therefrom which certainly merited serious consideration. The same is true of Mr. E. I. S. Hardinge in *LAND AND FREEDOM* of March-April, 1932. Anyone who has read both the books here considered and the trenchant articles mentioned, will not find a definite answer in this book to these distinguished critics or any evidence that the facts and reasoning therefrom have colored the author's thought. Why?

Another broad question that naturally arises is, how does the author arrive at exactly the same remedy and the effects of the remedy after taking a completely opposite view of the functioning of the basic factor in George's whole structure—Rent? It must be borne in mind that any consideration of Rent in production and distribution also involves wages and interest as inter-related factors. Thus, a fundamental distortion of one necessarily involves the other two factors. Further, the author knows that Rent will still be in existence even when collected by the Government so that, as far as Rent goes, the economic situation will be the same.

Here is seen a basic error in the analyses as given in the book—a serious one, too, since it is responsible for much confusion of thought as presented in the effort to show Rent as increasing the price at which commodities will be sold. Careful consideration of the presentation of the author's procedure in his attempt to prove his case indicates three exceedingly serious faults and in a matter which challenges the philosophy of so great a thinker as George and doing so on a principle which is one of the few that George is in entire agreement with his opponents, more is demanded than a loose discourse. Even if only incidental, the question of Rent and Price should have been adequately treated.

The greatest fault in the author's method is that of attempting to treat things separately which are, by their nature, inseparable. Next, the author gives us very incomplete statements of the problems he uses. Also, there are assumptions that are not proven at all. The reader of this review will note examples of these as they are given. Minor errors will be quite obvious as attention is called to them.

Early in the preface this statement is encountered: "The lack of purchasing power springs not, as is commonly supposed, from lowness of wages" but "from the highness of the prices the consumers must pay." Right here, this initial failure to regard low wages and high prices as one and the same things touches off a whole train of confused thought. The fact that an exchange of labors is at the bottom of all production and consumption, is ignored. Real wages—the things labor consumes—are ignored and we find the economic term "wages" involved determinedly with the monetary term "prices," although money is nothing but a medium of exchange. With this kind of start the argument is bound to grow more confused, and it does.

In a minute this follows: that George was plunged into a "sea of errors" by his "innocent acceptance" of Ricardo's law of rent which "forced him to begin his exposition from the most difficult end—that is, from the angle of the producer instead of the angle of the consumer." As a matter of fact, George was not forced as stated, but treated consumption as the end of production and so treated both "ends" as they should be. He did not stop with "price" of commodities at the point of exchange until he discussed exchange as a step from production to consumption. George traced production from the land to the consumer and from the consumer back to land so comprehensively, that it is difficult to account for the quoted statement at all.

The preface declares that George was 'plunged into the "absurdity" that "the benefits of labor-saving machinery are passed on to consumers in lower prices" and "are absorbed by landholders in higher rents—both at the same time." The author lays this "absurdity" to George's belief, taken from Ricardo, that Rent does not enter into Price. The fact that the social value of the opportunity to use machines in society could be absorbed by the owners of land

while the effectiveness of the machine in reducing the costs of production would reduce prices of commodities, is entirely unexplored! This lack of understanding of what Rent actually is keeps cropping up right along in the discussions with confusing uses of other terms—wages being the most important ambiguity.

Going to the body of the book in the first chapter dealing with the problem, we find Dr. Butler, the President of Columbia University and Ramsay MacDonald quoted and indicated as in "perplexity and confusion" about the "stoppage of industry," etc. After asking "why," the author is "convinced" that "the icy grip which the dead hand of an ancient political economy holds over the minds of men is responsible for the bewilderment."

As propaganda this is probably effective, but what these prominent men say publicly in order to guide the people has little to do with political economy, and no one who understands George is "bewildered" by the stoppage of industry. They know the cause.

"Why men work" is most interestingly written for popular minds, and if it were not for the fact that it is part of the set-up which is to lead to the conclusion that Rent increases prices, it would not need to be discussed. (Note: Although the author does not definitely say too often that Rent "increases" prices, the text is entirely occupied in attempting to prove that assumption).

Most students are satisfied with the dictum that men seek to satisfy their desires with the least possible effort, but the activities of Robinson Crusoe are chronicled for some pages before that dictum is finally reached. Inasmuch as there was no society, it becomes necessary to construct a "society" out of the lonely Crusoe. In this constructive society the conclusion is reached that "men cease work when desire is satisfied." Well! Well! We find that this society contained "no capitalists or landlords"—this notwithstanding that Crusoe's canoe which he constructed to "haul things in" is listed in the accompanying chart—as a "convenience." His "traps" and his "storehouse full" are also mentioned but not classified. Aren't these evidences of capital? Did not undisputed possession of the island constitute Crusoe as at least technically a landowner?

All of Crusoe's activities are most entertaining, but it would seem the only conclusive knowledge that can be learned from the study would be as to how an individual will act in a certain environment, when absolutely free. True, the narrative states that when Crusoe had enough he threw himself into unemployment, but it is not stated that an acknowledged landowner there could have thrown him out of work *before* he had enough!

In passing, it may be well to point out that all this seems to indicate if anything to the point, that "overproduction" is the cause of "the stoppage of industry." Not even "underconsumption" can be admitted as a cause, although earlier pages disparage both of these explanations. This reviewer got into similar cross currents earlier in life in attempts to prove George wrong, and finally found much more satisfaction by following a clear stream rather than flounder in eddies and whirlpools of his own making.

On page 20, the reader will encounter a subhead that may startle him: "Raising of Wages Illogical, Impractical and Unsound." In explaining this, we encounter one of the most confusing passages in the whole discussion. Here we see some peculiar idiosyncrasies. The author does not allow consumer and producer to become united in one person at any time. Neither will he discuss wages under the head of price. Surely, if a demonstration is to be made, it should be made in like terms. Is there any gain in clarity in discussing consumer's functions always in terms of money and producer's rewards in the economic term "wages?"

Again, it is stated "the interest of the consumers centers around the factor of price, whereas the interest of the producers centers around the factor of *income*." This constant use of unlike terms in connected discussion does not add to clarity and the matter is important. Should not the fact that producers exchange their labor for the labor of others wrapped up in commodities begin to clear up

the picture? Why not keep the fact that producers and consumers are the same people to the fore so that the exchange phase of all transactions will not be obscured? There is not time to straighten out all of this tangle either for the reader or author, even if it could be done.

"The heart of the whole question" is stated: "If the raising of wages compelled prices to rise as fast or even faster than wages go up, how, by this method, can the purchasing power of the masses be increased? The answer is, of course, that it can not thus be increased." Here another quite different answer involving the essential benevolence of the application of George's philosophy, is entirely ignored! Is there any reader of George who does not believe that if land were thrown open to labor on every hand on equitable terms, wages would rise? Would not the commodities produced increase the supply, thereby causing the prices of them to fall? Would not both of these effects be "increases in purchasing power"? The author himself in a most clear and graphic fashion, indicates how supply and demand regulates wages right at this point, but somehow never can connect up the wage-earner with the consumer completely. Neither does he show the influence of the margin of cultivation on the levels of wages. (As a matter of fact, if the author mentions the margin of cultivation anywhere, it was overlooked by this reviewer. This in an attack on the accepted function of Rent!)

To conclude this part of the review. The above are some of the evidences of the kind of rhetoric that is used to destroy a fundamental postulate in economics and cause us to disbelieve the findings of some of the world's greatest thinkers on a proposition upon which they are singularly united.

Scattered all through the first three chapters are errors that indicate a lack of grasp of the factors involved. For instance, on page 41 the author states "no subdivision of industry in the early periods" of American history. Again, on page 60, speaking of the value of land, it is stated that improvements of "private or public character" will raise the value of land. Improvements of a "private" character do not increase the value of land. If that were so, land value could be created anywhere by putting an improvement on land—even in the desert! On page 64, discussing the tremendous increases in the value of our natural resources, the author ascribes the increase to the "machines and discoveries of science." It is society's demand for the content of those natural resources that gives natural resources their enormous value. If only one person owned all the machines in the world, but there was no population, what would be the value of the world's resources? On page 65 the author does not regard it as any easier now to have apples in California and oranges in New York than it was before the railroads! Whew!

In several places in the volume, the author places great reliance on figures. This is natural, but when an effort is made to reduce the results of a great revolutionary change involving many opposing tendencies to such figures as can be applied to the single individual after the upheaval, the validity is nil. Such a computation would be impossible with the most elaborate actuarial methods and resources.

If the Government were to divide the 7.3 billions of taxes among the people, it is said (page 73) that it would finally become an addition of \$300 to the purchasing power of a family of five. As far as this single point is concerned, would not the Government's purchasing power be reduced by that same 7.3 billions?

Now we come to the question as to whether Rent increases or is added to price, or not. It must be ascertained, first, what the author contends in the matter of price.

The preface states, "Every new discovery, every invention and labor-saving device has meant, not any cheapening of commodities to the whole people, but simply that much more unearned increment 'for the owners of the earth.'" This is an important declaration. If this can be disproved, the whole case of Rent being added to Price falls to the ground.

One begins to doubt the preparatory statement immediately on reading a very graphic description of a "young man just starting out on the stormy sea of business life" who has somehow possessed himself of a great many commodities, apparently. He starts up in the morning with an "alarm clock" and during the day uses a catalogue of things coming from all parts of the earth which requires two full pages to list, winding up in the evening lying down on a pretty fine mattress and a good pillow. This young man uses "goods of a myriad kinds." There is an equally fascinating description of a young woman who apparently has the wherewithal to possess herself of numerous things for the home, too. These two people are given as samples and seem to have the things generally to be found in millions of American homes. Now, bear in mind, the author has not said a word of how this is all paid for actually, but does mention "money" in the case of the young woman. At any rate, following the young woman we are told that "the prices which the consumers pay are abnormally high." The discussion of this isolated half of the problem continues steadfastly—ignoring the more important half.

For, "How to decrease the price level" we are referred to Chart 3 which is an interesting catalogue of expenses from Producer to Consumer. Rent is included as an expense. There continues an admirable discussion about prices generally, constantly looking for indubitable proof that prices are abnormally high. What labors are used to pay for the commodities are absent.

The first factor that is encountered that can be accepted as increasing prices is found at page 35—taxes. There will be no quarrel with this assumption that taxes do raise prices. It almost seems as if this book should have begun here.

At page 55 the statement about goods being no cheaper now than ever is reiterated but more specifically—than "200 years ago." Up to this point it will be difficult for the reader to understand, if he considers the matter, how the two sample people mentioned, could have possessed themselves of all that long list of commodities in circumstances where the share of labor in what he produces has constantly dwindled to smaller proportions, if the basis of the exchange, prices, had not fallen in spite of the added taxes. If competition among laborers has a tendency to reduce their wages to the lowest level upon which they will consent to produce, how does it happen that the vast majority of their homes are filled with a complete catalogue of the products of labor, if prices of these things have not fallen? What a pity the author did not develop real wages out of all this graphic description,—that what labor consumes is his real wages.

If we glance at Table 1 offered in support of the "prices are no lower" theory, an item sticks out plainly as proof of this if we go by the figure—that is coal. Coal is shown at \$3.85 per ton about 1840 and steadily advances to \$11.00 per ton in 1920 to 1929. The figures are from a U. S. Finance Report of 1893 and later additions. Surely, here is proof that prices have not fallen. But is it because Rent is added to Price? Previously the author informed us the value of coal land has enormously increased during the very period that the price of coal has advanced. All this would seem to indicate cause and effect working to prove the author's case. But the actual cause of the rising cost of coal does not show in the table at all! The factor of monopoly is absent. By holding valuable coal lands out of use,—made possible by low taxation—the coal operator is able to limit the supply and thus force to the last limit the public can be made to pay. Moreover, the coal operators could if they desired, notwithstanding the greater volume of currency now used in our exchanges, sell coal at a lower price than is quoted for 1840, when the figures begin, and do it in the face of the enhanced land values involved.

So much for Table I. When Table II is examined, the price of commodities is shown as increasing almost steadily to a peak in 1920—this from 1831. This is a Labor Bureau report. Again beware of figures! It is common knowledge that we use a great deal more currency in making our exchanges than in 1831; consequently, prices

will read higher, by far. The wage level was much lower, quoted in money, and the variety of commodities the laborer could have much less.

The author previously shows that he understands that if a day's work nets \$3.00 and a pair of shoes cost him \$3.00, he is in exactly the same position when receiving \$10.00 for his day and paying \$10.00 for the shoes. For some reason there is no use made of this equation when considering the table, although that it applies is common knowledge.

Again the average price of commodities is shown in 1926 as 100 and in 1929 as 96.5. Not a large drop, but still opposite to the author's theory, because Rents were bounding skyward during the drop in the prices of goods. Further, during the depression, prices of many things have been forced up, while Rents have been tumbling. Certainly, if Rent increases prices, the law is not easily discernible. At any rate as far as references made thus far are concerned, there is no proof that prices have not fallen, but plain inference indicates the contrary. There is no indication in this that Rent increases Prices.

Due to the author's rambling method of presentation, it is necessary, now, to retrace, if we are to collate his views on Production and Consumption. In this connection, the author apparently does not think that production only ends when the product is in the hands of the consumer. The constant tendency to keep producer and consumer apart as if they were different beings, is manifest all through the various threads of his scattered discourse on this. He speaks of the consumer as a "work-giver" apparently unable to see that he is the worker himself.

"We have now traced to their tap roots" the grave economic problems, etc., is the way Chapter III begins, and: first, unemployment is charged to failure to buy enough goods; second, the first is not due to low wages, but to high prices; and, third, landowners are collecting Rent and therefore the Government is forced to levy taxes. Not a mention here of how speculation in land operates to cause unemployment; the fact that low wages and high prices are the same thing is again not suitable apparently for the author's purpose.

The advance of productive power is admirably depicted and is full of useful information. The railroad is given as the "Nation's leading labor-saving device." Ignoring the fact that the railroads through the reduction of the cost (in labor, etc.) make it much easier for all to have commodities, the author is content to point the growth of large fortunes to their owners.

This is immediately followed by the statement that "the pioneers in this wilderness were compelled to labor long and hard for the barest necessities." If that is so, and prices are the medium through which labor is exchanged for commodities, how does the lot of the pioneer and the present possession of the humblest of workers compare? How could the present situation exist if the prices of commodities measured in the labor exchanged for them were not lower?

The arguments other than those mentioned to prove that Rent increases Price are all scattered at random through the chapter. Early in the preface we read that Rent is earned by society itself, and goes to the landowners as an *unearned* income. Now, that postulate may suit the author's theory, but it does not illuminate the question as to what Rent is, and if the exhaustive inquiry conducted by George is to be entirely set at naught, a great deal more must be demanded. It is true Rent is mentioned here to justify the Government in taking it and abolishing taxes, but this incomplete definition is going to cloud the reasoning where Rent is involved all through the discussion. How society can "earn" a labor-saving should be explained fully.

In giving well deserved praise to Adam Smith, we find this attributed to him: he (Smith) after revealing the nature and law of Rent, divided the price of commodities into its three component parts—namely, rent, profit (interest) and wages and Rent is an income the consumer must pay. Assuming that Smith is correctly quoted, if Rent does actually consist in economies in production and distribu-

tion, how can it be figured in dollars and cents unless it is included as a minus quantity?

On page 34 occurs this statement: "this Rent of land is a value created by the public at large—by society itself. It is a product of the whole population." All right, of what does this value consist? We must know that before we put it into anything as definite as a schedule of the costs of production. The cost of production will include only the labors of that group of the population that aid in the production of a particular commodity. Why must a factor involving the "whole population" be added to the costs to the consumer of that particular commodity? If the author is sure of his assertion, he should explain it fully. As a matter of fact, it will be difficult. Prices are competitively fixed based on supply and demand. Rent represents certain *economies* and *advantages* inherent in a given site. How can these in any sense affect prices of goods sold there except to *reduce* them? Well may the author anticipate, as he does, "vigorous disputes" of assertions so loosely thrown together.

We are told that "the price of goods" is "precisely where all the trouble is." If Wages, Interest and Rent make up the costs of production upon which prices are fixed and at the margin of cultivation, Rent is 0, how will the addition of zero *increase* the price? Further, if Wages and interest seek a competitive level along with the price of commodities, how can Rent which constantly mounts as the margin is left, possibly be added to a price that remains on a competitive level with the site where Rent is zero?

It has seemed necessary, in this review, to include much matter that ordinarily could be dispensed with. But, when a writer starts out to upset the whole science of political economy as constructed from Adam Smith down through Henry George, it seems proper to examine his work in detail. That this work, so effectively written in many respects, may be splendid propaganda, does not alter the fact that by exhibiting to the public that the exponents of George can not agree on even his fundamental principles, it is rendered much less effective.

That Rent does *not* increase—does not add to price can be shown in many ways. This reviewer does not believe that the contrary has anywhere been made clear.

Take the description of the effects of "L" roads and Subways in Chicago and New York on the value of land. Splendidly described in the book—but a little deeper probing would have shown they constitute a striking disproof of the author's theory. First, the franchise values of those means of transportation are land values—Rent capitalized. The entire expense of those roads is borne by the fares of those who ride in them. Being a social product, they also increase land values. But, why must the expense of creating those land values be added to the price of the goods sold along those lines when the riders have already paid those expenses in their fares? Is it not an inviolable principle that competition among sellers absolutely compels the elimination of all but necessary costs? If that is so, how could a cost already paid for by the riders in "L's" and Subways possibly be added?

Here is a typical list of expenses and income that illustrates how rent actually reduces price: on the debit side there will be Rent, light, heat, power, freight, cartage, costs of goods sold, selling costs and delivery, along with administrative expenses; on the credit side there will be gross sales and other income. The income will be deposited in the bank and checks drawn against the balance to pay the debits. Among those checks will be the Rent check. That settles it—Rent is paid out of the prices received for the goods. What more? Just this; that every other check, with possibly an exception or two, will be very much *smaller* due to that payment of Rent. Light, heat, power, freight, cartage, cost of goods sold, selling costs will all be much lower, thus reducing the costs the consumer, after a fair profit is added, must pay. It is probable that *all* costs are lower. When costs per unit are figured, they are seen to be much lowered where high Rents are paid. Volume of sales comes into the picture reduc-

ing all of the costs even all the way back to the land. How then does Rent increase price?

Again, here is a storekeeper,—his lease runs out and is renewed on a lower basis. Does he immediately reduce prices? Not at all. The prices are governed by the demand and supply for his goods. He has simply found that he was paying rent for an economy in his costs that he didn't get and made his landlord see it. On the other hand, if the demand slackens and he is "loaded up," he will be compelled to reduce his prices while his rent remains the same, while if the demand quickens, he will advance his prices if it appears the supply is inadequate. All this regardless of fluctuation in his Rent.

To make this economy phase clearer, consider a genuine efficiency engineer's services to a factory. He shows the manufacturer how to cut his costs in various ways. His check will be paid out of gross sales, but the economies he has effected will appear in lower list prices or larger discounts.

Society has paved a street. Society paid for the pavement with tax money. The paving of the street increased Rent. Must this increased Rent be added to the price of goods? If so, why when society has already paid for it and will maintain it through its taxes? Must it be paid twice? Once by society and again by the consumer?

Wages seek a level governed by what labor can secure where no Rent is paid; the same is true of interest on Capital, but Rent nowhere finds a level. It is a differential that arises from zero to an almost fabulous peak. To assert that this differential factor Rent must be added to the factors Wages and Interest as a part of the cost of production which must be added to the price exacted from the consumer is to put a mathematical burden on the price-fixer that few could assume.

Actually, if the hair must be split, there are three distinct factors embraced in payments for the use of land. First, there is the enhanced price due to the landowners demanding not what the land is worth today, but what it will be worth at a future time—this is sometimes called Speculative Rent. Then, there is the enhanced price caused by the fact that lands held out of use, force the remainder in use to a higher price—this may be called Monopoly Rent. Speculative Rent will be largely governed by estimates of Interest involved while Monopoly Rents will distribute themselves over lands in use. Both of these "Rents" will be added to price because society has not paid for their creation. Neither Speculative nor Monopoly Rents are actually true Economic Rents, and are only so-called because they are attached to land and are included in payments for its use. Possibly this may account for some of the confusion into which we are inevitably plunged when this subject on Rent and Price is discussed.

If the fact that Rent is an economy in the production and physical distribution of commodities paid for by taxes and cooperative forces of society, is kept in mind, it is seen that Rent actually accompanies a *reduction* in prices and as competition compels the elimination of all but unavoidable costs, Rent can not be successfully added to Price.

However, even with Speculative and Monopoly Rents added to taxes and appearing as factors in prices leading toward bankruptcy, it is quite evident that true Rent usually overcomes the upward tendencies in the prices of commodities which have actually fallen—measured in the amount of labor that must be exchanged for them. Otherwise the mass of people could not possibly possess themselves of what they visibly have while working shorter hours.

A consideration of the chain store almost completely disproves the theory advanced. Prices are uniform in all stores of a single chain regardless of the fact that the Rents paid vary by wide margins.

Another point. Where are low prices of goods generally found—where Rents are high or where they are low? If there is any great difference it indicates that where Rents are high there will be found, in a great city at least, lower prices.

A final thought. Labor itself is in many respects bought and sold as a commodity. It has a price. That price, like commodity prices,

is determined by competition and supply and demand. Labor, also pays Rent for his upkeep. Does the Rent the laborer pays increase the price that labor will receive for what he has to sell? Or—is not labor compelled to accept what competitors are willing to take regardless of what Rent they pay? It might be well for the author to explore this phase. An attack on the functions of Rent is far-reaching.

It would have seemed that an attack of so fundamental a nature as the author has made, a complete scientific analysis of Rent would have been the starting point. But both Rent and Price are scattered in a hit or miss fashion that has made this review one of the most difficult to approach constructively that this writer has ever contemplated.

The author announces the production of two more books. "The Murder of Economic Science" and the "Mistakes of Henry George." These books will no doubt be well written and breathe a noble spirit of idealism. It is hoped that he will establish his premises on much less controvertible ground and use a more scientific method and terminology, otherwise they, too, will cause "vigorous dispute." The titles of both books are, incidentally, ominous.

All that has been said has not in the least altered the high respect this reviewer has had for Mr. Jorgensen's enthusiasm and splendid efforts to spread the light as he sees it. It is hoped that the undoubted propaganda value of the later chapters will not be offset by the challenge to economic science in the first three.

Whether that will be so or not, the book is exceedingly well worth reading and study. One part will give the reader a splendid chance to find out whether he knows what he knows or not, and that part where he comes into agreement with George, will be found an admirable method and style to be used in placing the Remedy and its effects instructively and entirely before any reader.

NORMAN C. B. FOWLES.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROPERTY

By JOHN Z. WHITE

Beaver Press, Grenville, Pa., 1935

In this timely and interesting book, Mr. White presents a legal viewpoint of the effect of grants of land by the State to individual owners. It is a common belief that because of deeds of land in "fee simple" to individuals which extend back to the sovereignty it is impossible for the State now to recover the value of the land without doing violence to constitutional provisions protecting private rights.

The author makes clear the distinction between a contract and a grant by the State. The Dartmouth College case, the Charles River Bridge case and other cases famous in history, are discussed in detail to show the tendency of the courts to preserve to the State those sovereign rights and powers without which democratic government is impossible.

Tenure of land is a public thing—a delegation of a sovereign power. Failure to guard the sovereign power expressed by land holding and to permit the value of the land holding power to be privately appropriated is a derogation of sovereignty and tends to destroy democracy.

If an aristocratic society is desired nothing needs to be done. The manor house theory of tenure of land is exemplified today in Franklin D. Roosevelt who is to the "manor born." It is quite in keeping with President Roosevelt's tradition to see nothing incongruous in the large land values held by Vincent Astor. There is nothing of the hypocrite in the President in this respect nor inconsistent with his warfare against those who grind the face of the poor or take speculative profits without regard to the upkeep of the nation at large. The ownership of the manor house and manor lands, to Mr. Roosevelt, carries with it not only the duty of seeing to it that all the manor people, tenants and workers, are fed and clothed but also the consciousness that failure to meet this duty is destructive of the manor family itself. So the Mitchells and the Wiggins who take profits without responsibility are met with righteous Rooseveltian indignation.

tion, whereas the landed families who give benevolent consideration to the tenantry receive a complacent blessing.

Against such a benevolent aristocracy Mr. White shows the necessity of preserving to the State its full sovereignty over land if democracy is to endure.

Land cannot be owned. It can only be used.

A labor product can be owned outright in the sense that it can be consumed. Eggs can be physically eaten up.

A land title is a franchise for use. Land cannot be consumed.

In this distinction lies the fundamental difference between a grant of land and a bill of sale of goods.

The proposition that land grants and franchises are the same in legal principle is sound law.

This being so, it follows that nothing more is granted than is directly contained in the terms of the grant. A franchise grant is strictly construed in favor of the sovereignty.

A grant of land made in 1735, for example, contains no contract that conveys away values created in 1935. What is granted is contained within the four corners of the document. Nothing is contained in any deed ancient or modern that requires the community in 1935 to deliver the beneficial use of a school house, a library, a paved street or other public service upon the land without collecting the cost therefor.

Chief Justice Marshall in 1810 in a Georgia land case held that a grant by the State is a contract. In 1840, however, Justice Miller, supported by Chief Justice Chase and Justice Field, dissented in *Washington University vs. Rouse* (8 Wall. 443). He said:

"We do not believe that any legislative body, sitting under a State constitution of the usual character, has a right to sell, to give, or to bargain away forever the taxing power of the State . . . To hold . . . that any one of the annual legislatures can, by contract, deprive the State forever of the power of taxation, is to hold that they can destroy the government which they are appointed to serve, and that their action in that regard is strictly lawful."

The tendency of the courts is in the direction of the sound doctrine quoted. The power of the State to tax is paramount over private rights.

Private possession of land, necessary to preserve the fruits of labor, does not of itself impair sovereignty. It is only when we permit the profits arising from this exercise of sovereign power to flow into private pockets that such impairment occurs.

Democracy may delegate its police power to a magistrate without impairing its sovereignty but if it were held that the magistrate acquired a vested right to his office and could administer the office for his private gain it would be a derogation of sovereignty.

Franchises for the use of streets by utility companies are no longer granted in perpetuity or for years without a valuation to be paid for use.

The true legal concept of the tenure of land as a franchise for use subject to valuation is growing in consciousness and is tending to dispel the idea that the State having granted land is without power to collect the value of the use.

This book is a strong plea for the recognition of those legal principles which constitute the foundation of democratic government and without democracy, cannot endure.

It is well worth a studious reading.—WALTER FAIRCHILD.

A BACHELOR OF LAWS "CORRECTS" A MASTER OF ECONOMICS

The publication of "Progress and Poverty" in 1879 let loose a flood of criticisms of Henry George. By hundreds, magazine articles, books, tracts, pamphlets, newspaper reviews poured forth, demonstrating George's "errors," and pointing out "fallacies" in his reasoning. More than one hundred have come into the possession of this reviewer, and he has not yet gathered all.

Many critics were not content to expose "flaws," but aimed their poisoned darts at the figure of Henry George. These shall remain nameless.

Today they are forgotten. Only a historian delving into obscure corners, could unearth their names and writings. "Progress and Poverty" lives on, sound as ever. It has made a profound impression on modern economic thought, and no economic treatise is so widely read. It is studied in our colleges and universities. Harvard, Princeton, University of Illinois, amongst others, (as the reports of The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation show) buy "Progress and Poverty" in increasing quantities.

A new school of critics has arisen. These, starting out with the admission that whatever economic knowledge they possess was acquired from Henry George, proceed, gently but firmly, to "correct" his reasoning. He being no longer available for personal attack, they now center their fire on his philosophy.

Of this ilk are George Bernard Shaw, whose book, "The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism" we reviewed in these columns in the July-August, 1928 issue. (p. 121).

On another page, our co-worker, Mr. Fowles, competently handles another author who believes George "erred."

Our Australian friends, confusing interest with usury, are certain that George fumbled on that subject.

Most critics of George, while puffing with a sense of their own importance, wind up by exposing their own ignorance of fundamental economic principles.

Now comes "A Tax Talk to Business Men by William J. Ogden, LL. B." (Why is it necessary for our author to reveal that he is a Bachelor of Laws? What especial qualifications in economics does that degree confer?)

Mr. Ogden writes, (pp. 154-155):

"If ever 'truth' was 'crushed to earth,' the great cardinal truth of the Single Tax has so suffered at the hands of its professed authoritative protagonists.

"It is to rescue the truth from a jumble of truth and error, that this little book is written.

"Right here I want to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to Henry George. He, more than any other man, opened the way for the Single Tax on land values. The truth that his heart revealed is not destroyed by his manifest error. He will be remembered for his greatness of soul, his self-giving love for humanity, and his powerful presentation of the vital importance of a just system of taxation."

And at page 167, Mr. Ogden humbly writes:

"I have found the solution of his error, and with head bowed in deepest reverence, confess myself his grateful debtor for the revealed truth of the Single Tax, which is herein freed from any taint of Socialism or Communism."

Henry George, writes Mr. Ogden, "simply blundered in a splendid human effort to lead men to the truth." (p. 148).

He erred "in attributing the origin of land value to such a general and indefinite thing as 'population.'" (p. 149).

Will Mr. Ogden tell us when and where George wrote this? It was our impression that Henry George clearly showed that it was the presence and activities of people which produced land values. If population alone made land values, China, with 400 million people, would have higher land values than the United States with 125 million people.

Mr. Ogden contends "that public services are the reason, the source, and the continuance of land values," (p. 70) and that "land values are the products of the services of government." (p. 35).

His reasoning may be judged from this non sequitur:

"Here (in Maryland) our landowners pay taxes on their lands. They therefore earn the increment to their land values." (p. 63).

He repeatedly falls into the common error of referring to the Georgist philosophy as a "tax system." (pp. 83, 86, 107, 112, 154). Rather, it is a philosophy that would abolish taxation. For the community to collect its community-created land values and use them for community needs can never be called taxation. It is but to recognize the difference between "mine and thine" on the one hand, and "curs" on the other.

In writing as I have, I would not be understood as claiming inerrancy for Henry George. He would have been the last one to make such claim. But, I submit, it will take a more astute intelligence than Messrs. Bernard Shaw, Jorgenson, our Australian friends and Mr. Ogden, collectively, possess, to find any "lapsi linguae" in the numerous writings and speeches of the great master of economic reasoning.

Forty years ago, Mr. Ogden made the same claims in the columns of *The New Earth*. The editor of LAND AND FREEDOM pointed out to him that land values might exist, and often did exist, independently of public service. Mr. Ogden persists in his fallacy.

And here it will be interesting to quote from that article by Mr. Ogden:

"When I conceive of trade without roads, I may then conceive of land value arising without government service. When distance has been obliterated; and goods can be transferred without a consideration of the elements of time, space or resistance, then rent will disappear, and the dreams of some of our friends realized; but I am inclined to think that as long as we have legs, we'll use 'em, and that roads will always remain, and with them rent."

Well, the very thing Mr. Ogden conceived as impossible, has come to pass. Airplanes can and do carry mail and merchandise, "without roads;" "distance has been obliterated" (almost) *but land rent keeps increasing*.

Why? Because every human activity, even flying in the air, requires land, and those who "own" our earth can charge the users Rent, *without rendering any service in return*.

Mr. Ogden claims that George failed to perceive that individual right to land value is as clearly defined as individual right to any property produced by an individual.

Evidently our author is unaware that there are six qualities which distinguish land from private property, and therefore stamp it as unique.

1. The earth on which we live was not produced by any human being, but is the free gift of the Creator to all his children.
2. It is limited in quantity.
3. It is essential to our existence, because we can produce nothing without it.
4. It does not owe its value to anything which landowners choose to put upon it.
5. It owes its value entirely to the presence and activities of the community.
6. It cannot be carried away or concealed.

Were he clearly to grasp the significance of these distinctions, he would not write:

"A good title to individual ownership in the land and all the value that attaches to it is therefore founded upon the same right of self-ownership that is the foundation of the right to own personal property." (p. 90).

Mr. Ogden informs us that before his death, Henry George modified his declaration that "private property in land is unjust." (p.112).

Pray, when and where did this take place? This reviewer is authorized to offer Mr. Ogden \$500.00 to substantiate that statement.

Chapter XVIII is entitled "The Error of Henry George." Our author attempts to prove that George made "a fundamental error in omitting the largest and most important factor in production, viz., Government." (pp. 144-145). Mr. Ogden contends that land value is produced by an individual "as truly as was the house and personal property therein." (p. 150).

If this were true, how will Mr. Ogden explain why land values decline when population moves away?

This chapter might more accurately have been entitled "The Errors of William J. Ogden, LL. B."

Mr. Ogden has been familiar with the Georgist philosophy at least forty years, but, as his book amply demonstrates, he has failed to grasp it, not only in its material phases, but in its vastly greater spiritual implications.

Henry George sought to introduce a spiritual condition of equality in a material condition of inequality. Only that which is spiritual is constant; that which is material must ever be inconstant. Our common Mother, the Earth, being material and inconstant, rather than spiritual and constant, does not yield to her children the same wages for the same labor.

Henry George showed how we could *approximate* a spiritual condition of equality in a material condition of inequality by expressing the inequalities in nature in land rent, and distributing the land rent equally amongst all Earth's children.

For that he will ever be remembered, long after his critics are forgotten.—B. W. BURGER.

PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

"Labor Relations" by George A. Briggs of Los Angeles, member of the Federal Relations Board of the 15th District, sends forth a pamphlet of nineteen pages which treats of the Georgist philosophy. Incidentally it touches upon the abuse of patents. The author states that if the land value tax is insufficient it might be added to by "steeply" graded taxes on incomes and inheritances. The word seems deliberately chosen. He says: "Such taxes would compensate for failure, if we did fail, to identify and abolish lesser legalized monopolies overshadowed by patents, tariffs, franchises and land monopolies." We do not believe that there are any "lesser monopolies" not included in this category, and they are not of sufficient importance to justify "steeply" graded taxes on incomes and inheritances, nor any such taxes at all. If it be found necessary to resort to such taxes, which we do not for a moment believe, they must be defended solely on the need for additional revenue that *might* arise and not as remedial measures for the correction of economic inequalities. All the lesser monopolies will disappear with the disappearance of the basic monopoly on which they rest.

* * *

We all know and love Peter Witt, of Cleveland. Certainly the greatest orator in the movement today, he is also an entertaining and forcible writer. Here from his pen is a neatly printed pamphlet of sixteen pages entitled "How Economic Ignorance Causes Depressions." He tells of the work of Tom L. Johnson to whose memory he is deeply attached. He relates how a few years ago the city of Cleveland was worth fifty cents an acre and how since the days of Moses Cleaveland it has risen to be worth many millions of dollars. He enforces his plea for economic change in the system by many interesting local illustrations. The pamphlet may be had for ten cents a copy with reduction for quantities.—J. D. M.

Correspondence

NEED OF FUNDAMENTALS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

A multitude of words anent our untoward and unnecessary economic material condition, but nothing along the line of remedies in simplified fundamental form.

Many reputations made in giving a speech or writing an article on existing conditions, in which nothing of importance is mentioned. There must be a reason for this, which must inevitably be termed indifference or ignorance.

It seems incredible that the so-called moulders of public opinion are unaware of the source and magnitude of our material supply—THE EARTH—sufficient for all our daily needs, provided same is treated in a natural way, in accord with the laws of justice.

The general notion seems to prevail that injustice is largely prevalent, but as an actual fact there is no such law. Apply the law of Justice and the thought of injustice vanishes into its native nothingness.

The entire situation revolves around a seeming lack of necessities,

such as Food, Raiment and Shelter. It would seem unnecessary to repeat to an intelligent people that these necessities are secured in only one way, viz., by application of our intelligence, muscular power and a sense of cooperation, to our supply, THE EARTH, which was supposedly created for all mankind. Man was given dominion over the earth (Gen. 1:26). We ask, what man, the one who first saw and claimed it, or all mankind?

It would be equally consistent and ethical to allow a monopoly of the sunshine and fresh air as the earth, a heritage from the Creator, which should not be held out of use for speculative purposes. We are either mentally blind or morally crooked. Cannot we realize that all wars are largely, almost entirely, caused by our economic maladjustment? They originate in greed, largely because of desire for additional territory to exploit. Men are also perfectly oblivious to crime conditions, especially among the younger generation.

This was especially emphasized in an article which appeared in the *Monitor* of February 21, by Ralph A. Felton, entitled, "Jobs or Jails for Youth," in which he states that eighty per cent of juvenile delinquents in a New Jersey reformatory were out of work when they got into trouble. They were inherently honest, but needed food in order to exist.

Is there a simple remedy for this unjust condition? There is only one scientific and ethical method, viz., cease penalizing (taxing) labor products, and take land values for public purposes.

Labor products belong to the producer; land values are produced by the community and should be appropriated for community uses. Of course, this solution is too simple for our expert economists to contemplate. It implies no statistical elaboration, historical data or prognostication anent the future; merely functions in the here and now. Why not give it a little brotherly thought for a change?

We cannot continue to ignore these fundamentals and maintain the title of Brotherhood.

Chicago, Ill.

F. J. EDDY.

COGENT AT LEAST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your May-June issue there appears a reply to Mr. Walter Fairchild by Harold S. Buttenheim in which Mr. Buttenheim closes with:

"Nor need the Single Taxers fear that the fundamental thesis of their great leader will be weakened by constructive attempts to re-study and re-state it for the world of 1935."

By all means, Mr. Buttenheim, re-study and re-state "Progress and Poverty," but when you do, also re-study and re-state the Commandment:

"Thou shalt not steal!"

For after you have brushed aside all of the trappings, the philosophy of Henry George reduces itself to this:

Let not the community take from the individual that which the individual creates. Let not the individual take from the community that which the community creates.

Unfortunately Single Taxers generally, go off on the same tangent that Mr. Buttenheim has. They accept the Single Tax as the end instead of the means to an end, the end being individual freedom.

Cleveland, O.

NAHAM BEN ISRAEL.

JOHN LUXTON RETURNS TO THE ENCOUNTER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In the May-June number of LAND AND FREEDOM Mr. Loomis of Chicago attempts to justify his fallacious claim that there will be a selling value to land under the Single Tax. He says that in my reply I assume that Single Tax is to take one hundred per cent of the economic rent. Most certainly I do. And furthermore I declare it to be the only way in which full justice can be done and an equitable distribution of wealth be made. Mr. Loomis probably expects that

the full economic rent will be paid in money but in that he is wrong. We quite agree with Henry George in his suggestion that we permit the landowner to retain a percentage of the rent and thus escape the losses incident to renting lands in the way he mentions in "Progress and Poverty," Book VIII, Chapter II. In so doing we are collecting the entire rent, one hundred per cent of it. The landlord's services are equal to X per cent, and the rent which he pays over is equal to one hundred per cent plus X per cent. If we did not pay the landowner for collecting the ground rent, either from himself or from his tenants, we would have to pay an agent to do so. Thus we collect one hundred per cent of the economic rent, services plus money, or perhaps goods and services of equal value to money if the necessity for receiving the rent in that manner should eventuate. It seems to me that to be a good Single Taxer a man must first be a good economist, and that is where Mr. Loomis' trouble seems to be.

Mr. Buttenheim is quite enamoured of the idea of triple tax. It is enough for Single Taxers to know that he does not believe that all privilege and exploitation would be abolished by the socialization of ground rent, and that all community expenditures are reflected in increased land values. We do. A full and complete demonstration of the former must wait until we have advanced far enough to try it. Philosophy points that way to those who have logical minds. A detailed account of facts is necessary to prove the basis for his disbelief of the latter. Such facts must be actual and bona fide, not figures from reports of State tax officials, State Real Estate Boards, Chambers of Commerce, and other interested bodies. Until such facts are presented to us Mr. Buttenheim must not be offended if we do not believe him. We must have a chance to winnow the chaff from the grain, to point out what are real, legitimate community expenditures, and not just graft, waste, and downright loot. Away with most government reports. As contributions to our knowledge they are not worth the paper they are printed on, nor the energy necessary to read them. So Mr. Buttenheim's answer to Mr. Fairchild falls flat.

But it is not this which impells me to find fault with Mr. Buttenheim's logic. He attacks our consistency in fervently embracing the "benefits-received" theory of taxation, and rejecting the "ability-to-pay" theory. We do not ignore the fact that ability to pay has often resulted from benefits received. And in taxing according to benefits received do we go out of our way to exempt those who are able to pay because of benefits they have received? Under Single Tax the thing that will decide will be the benefits received. Mr. Buttenheim might have made a better case for himself and asked the question which every advocate of the "ability-to-pay" theory asks those who advocate the other method. The question is, "How are you going to tax those who haven't the ability to pay for benefits received?" That would give us the chance to answer in a way that shows that Single Tax is not going to be partial tax reform, weak and without teeth. The answer is that in case an individual or corporation has enjoyed a site value and either has not produced any economic rent through non-use of the site to its fullest possibility, or has made way with, squandered, dissipated the economic rent, the State or community will pry such individual or corporation from such site and lease it to the highest bidders. It is the moral duty of society to relieve members of society of burdens beyond their strength. To relieve the holder of a valuable site from the burden of carrying it when he shows his positive unfitness for the job is justice, justice to a poor weak brother, and justice to those of us who are ready to show their ability to make the most of such an opportunity.

In most instances, since man is naturally industrious and ambitious always seeking improvement, and creating new wants as he satisfies old ones, it follows that if we tax according to benefits received, we are also taxing according to ability to pay. But the method of taxing according to ability to pay is not always taxing according to benefits

received. Taxes on wages and interest are not taxes on benefits received, for true wages and true interest are received in return for services of equal value. To tax them is to create a one-sided condition in which something is given in return for nothing. Taxes on land values are taxes on benefits received, and such taxes create a balance, value for value, if the taxes equal one hundred per cent of the economic rent. It is idle to argue that wages and interest are received only because we receive the benefits of government, security and justice. We may receive our full wages under conditions of no government, and the best governments can not secure our wages to us.

There is *no* ethical *nor* economic justification for a system of taxation based even *in part* on the principle that the strong, the clever, or the lucky, should bear the burden of the weak, or the stupid, or the luckless, Mr. Buttenheim to the contrary, notwithstanding. Such talk is sentimental bosh, and worst of all, it bolsters up a situation that will wreck the public if not stamped out. It is ethical and it is economic justice that we have a system of taxation that will not permit the strong and the clever to be robbed for the misfits of society, that will not allow the existence of a "lucky class" nor of a privileged class, a system that will guarantee to each the fruits of his labor, that will permit no man to eat except in the sweat of his brow, nor any man to reap where he has not sown. Such a system, by assuring every man economic justice, will gradually produce men who are strong, clever and just. We believe that Single Tax will do this, that no coddling, nor paternalism, nor charity, nor despotism can do it, in short we believe in a true democracy. It is too bad that Mr. Buttenheim claims familiarity with "Progress and Poverty." It is too evident that his knowledge of the truths therein exposed is purely superficial. Brooklyn, N. Y.

JOHN LUXTON.

HOW ABOUT PAYMENT FOR SERVICE OF COLLECTION?

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The confusion of thought shown by some of your correspondents regarding the selling value of land under the Georgist system will disappear if it is kept in mind that rent is for public service and for access to advantages maintained by the public either with public or private funds.

The service bill is like the gas bill or the electric light company's bill.

It would be as much in order to allow a consumer of gas a discount as compensation for paying his bill as it would be to leave the land owner a percentage for turning in the rent. A discount for prompt payment might be considered; but a discount for payment, never.

In case of a hotel or office building, the owner needs a location for his building just as he needs a roof on his building. He would pay his rent, all of it; just as he would pay for the roof, all of it. In both cases because he wished to be considered honest.

If the rent is proper and reasonable, it is what the public must have to maintain the advantages for which the rent is paid. If it is not all turned in, the public incurs a loss servicing the location. Any loss would have to be made up by either stock assessments (taxes) levied on the citizens or else by curtailment of the service. In the latter case it would be made up by sacrifice and hardship.

When people "invest in land," they are really not investing in the land at all; but investing in an opportunity to buy our public service at less than the market rate and to sell it back to us at the market (the rental) rate.

So long as and whenever land has a selling price we may be certain that the Georgist system is not in force. When it is in force, land will have no more selling value than has the privilege of buying gas from the gas company. As a matter of fact land is, as one of your correspondents so nicely says, just a place to work—just a privilege. As the privilege of buying gas has no selling value in the market now, so land will have none under our system—and for the same reason, that there will be nothing to be made buying for re-sale. All unused

land will be unclaimed land and the competition of this "commons" will prevent other land from having a price other than its rent.

Stockton, Calif.

L. D. BECKWITH.

RENT, TAXES AND PRICES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

You have ably condemned (March-April issue) the futile "New Deal" efforts to regulate wages, instead of opening up natural opportunities for the free production on which alone they depend. The effort to help wages by ploughing under and killing off production so as to raise prices, is so obviously unnatural, however, as to arouse resentment notwithstanding "our decline" in independent thinking, and it is important to clearly point out that even the direct purpose of this New Deal effort (raising prices) is absolutely wrong; that the free production which alone insures normal wages also insures their natural purchasing power.

Whatever reduces the cost and prices of products, increases the purchasing power of wages, which of course is the only measure of their highness or lowness. And as reduction of taxes on production, and use of improved tools and methods of producing, reduce both costs and prices, they are the natural ways of increasing purchasing power and are therefore wholly desirable.

Failure to recognize this obvious truth arises from established interferences with the free employment of labor in producing so as to earn wages, for which there is only the one remedy of freeing access to land. It cannot be reasonably questioned that whatever reduces the cost and prices of products is inherently beneficial.

This truth makes it practically important to show how the taking of rent for public uses will really affect the cost and prices of labor products and the consequent purchasing power of normal wages; for the accepted fact that rent cannot directly enter into price would seem to exclude any effect of Single Tax on prices.

It is only necessary, however, to bear in mind the equally accepted truth that taxes on production do enter into cost and price; and that such taxes must be substituted for any rent that is privately diverted;—in order to see that this privately-diverted rent does actually enter indirectly into costs and prices as taxes on production; and that Single Tax would cut out all such substituted taxes from costs of production, with corresponding reduction of prices.

It is of course true that all the advantages of favored sites over marginal (no-rent) land, must in any case be paid by the favored users; but payment to government will put an end to present enormous taxes on production, and also to present high production costs due to the speculative withholding of land from use which pushes rent-free production onto poorer land.

But the great reduction of cost and prices directly resulting from public collection of rent, is not all that must result from it. For it is unquestionably true that public collection of rent will eliminate interest costs due to the present false capitalizing of that portion of rent which is now privately-diverted; and it is also certain that general prosperity due to free employment and production will make capital plentiful so long at least as prosperous human beings prefer to insure themselves against forced or voluntary retirement, instead of relying on humiliating pensions; so that further reduced costs and prices must naturally result with corresponding increased purchasing power of natural wages.

But here is the fundamental error which causes futile and foolish efforts to unnaturally control costs and prices: Namely, failure to recognize that *there is a natural wage*; that the normal products of labor properly measure wages; that under equalized opportunities of production, with proper use of known tools and methods of production, and with freedom from tribute to idle ownership, "natural wages" are automatically determined by natural production. And these natural wages with their natural purchasing power, call for natural instead of arbitrarily regulated conditions.

Reading, Pa.

W. G. STEWART.

MORE ABOUT INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. T. J. Kelly, in his very entertaining letter on this subject, sets out quite a number of fundamental economic truths which I think all Single Taxers will fully endorse. Georgists who oppose interest, however, will not be satisfied. It is not what Mr. Kelly puts into his letter that is vital, but what he leaves out. Friday, making a fishing net for Crusoe, is entitled to receive fish while the net lasts, (the equivalent of hire), but when it is worn out he should get nothing at all. If he would eat fish indefinitely he must make nets indefinitely. He cannot, under the circumstances in which he is placed and where no "money" exists, eat without working unless he owns land. *The onus is on him to replace his capital.* Had Friday, however, been able to lend Crusoe the price of a net, say twenty dollars, the contract, under conditions such as exist in civilized countries, would have been that Crusoe should supply him with fish until such time as the twenty dollars were repaid, and Crusoe himself, *not Friday*, would have had to make all his nets after the first. And, although the repayment of the loan would end Crusoe's obligation to feed Friday, it would affect not the latter's power to obtain fish without working, since he would re-lend the twenty dollars and repeat the performance with other borrowers, ad infinitum. He could also pass this power on to his heirs and assigns for ever.

Mr. Kelly's insistence on the perishability of *tangible* capital is a very strong argument in favor of those who repudiate interest as levied under existing conditions. I would like to see him attempt to persuade your readers that the twenty dollars must perish *by the mere effluxion of time* in the same way. In order to forestall time-wasting replies I would emphasize that the periodical re-payment of loans, as shown above, does not affect my argument. Neither does the fact that fishing nets add enormously to the production of fish. No one denies the existence of "economic interest."

In conclusion, I would like to say that a study of the position in New Zealand goes to show that the economic rent of the dominion is approximately one-third of the national production. No calculation based on Ricardo's law, can make it any more at present. Interest takes about the same proportion. It is futile then to assert, as some supporters of interest do, that interest is merely economic rent in disguise. A small amount of it may be, but not the bulk. I think the position is much the same in other countries, and that is the reason I hold that the "Socialization of Rent" will treble wages, for I believe, both rent and interest *paid to idlers*, will be eliminated under the Georgian plan.

Auckland, New Zealand.

C. H. NIGHTINGALE.

RURAL "LAND VALUES"

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your May-June issue Harold S. Buttenheim seems, at first glance, to dispose of the claim of Walter Fairchild in the preceding issue, that rural areas tend to have less of their total real estate valuation in land values than do urban areas. Citing the sixteen States which furnish assessment figures bearing on this question, Mr. Buttenheim purports to show that, "without exception, improvements constituted a larger proportion of total real estate values in urban than in rural areas."

This does not, however, demolish Mr. Fairchild's case. Mr. Buttenheim errs in identifying the "land value" in these impressive looking statistics with the true economic land value which Georgists would tax. The urban land values cited in the statistics probably are not far from being identical with what we mean by land values. Agricultural land value, on the other hand, as interpreted by assessment officials, commonly includes very much more than the component which we call land value or site value. Of a farmer's real estate, they account only his house, barns and other structures as improvements, and consider the market price of his land to be his "land value." In so doing, they ignore the fact that often by far

the greater part (sometimes practically all) the selling price of the farm land is due to improvements *in* (as distinct from *on*) the land, such as its cleared, smoothed and fenced condition, its artificial soil enrichment, invisible drainage system, etc. These are as truly improvements as barns and silos, though not so accounted in the figures used by your correspondent, and are now taxed as "land value." Under our plan they would be exempt. Probably a great obstacle to Single Tax progress amongst farmers is this misapprehension as to what we mean by land values; a misapprehension from which your correspondent does not appear to be free.

Norfolk, Conn.

JOSEPH R. CARROLL.

THE TAX RACKET

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The old tax "racket," suggested to Louis XIII, by his prime minister, Richelieu, "taxes should be levied in proportion to the ability to pay," is being worked a-plenty by politicians and news reporters, also cartoonists. Even some statesmen and a few editors, who are a bit hazy on political and social economics and the evil effects of taxation, are trying to justify the imposition of an income tax on corporations and individuals who are the most capable, while utterly disregarding the fact that such taxes are wrapped up with and included in the price of goods and services that everybody needs to buy, and, "the consumer pays the tax."

They also ignore the fact that, in trade, business, industry and commerce, potential buyers and sellers are often "kept apart by price." They appear to forget that the unemployed are in their unhappy state because those who are working cannot buy all they want on account of high prices and low wages. They overlook the fact that in taxing the rich, the poor and all others are taxed by proxy. About the same money is spent but less labor is paid for.

It may be soothing to the emotions to "soak the rich" with taxes but it doesn't get us anywhere. We only succeed in making our own life harder and our country a less comfortable place in which to live. Those who are known as "Captains of Industry" and are the managers of "Big Business" cannot employ more labor or pay higher wages when their product is unsaleable due to high prices that must be demanded to pay overhead that is swollen by tax levies, and cost of collecting and paying those taxes. They are helpless in the matter of creating demand by cutting the price of their product while government throttles them with taxes, hampers them with regulations and requires them to perform governmental functions such as: Collecting taxes from consumers with which to pay their own assessments.

There are few, I believe, who question the high motive behind President Roosevelt's attack on "bigness," and, his objective may (?) be desirable, but there are those who predict, and I think they are right, that the methods suggested, some of which seem likely to be adopted, will prove to be very disappointing as reform measures and will retard, rather than promote, recovery. It is certain that taxing the rich who get their income by selling services or goods to the rest of us, holds out no hope to consumers that the price of anything which everybody wants to buy will come down. On the other hand, there is reason to anticipate much higher prices for consumer's goods and services and, due to diminished demand, a great reduction in the prices for capital goods such as wheat, cotton and other basic commodities, and labor.

Instead of more taxes being levied to further burden everybody the taxes now in force should be shifted from where they now are to where they would be a commanding factor in reducing the price of everything that everybody wants to buy and at the same time raise wages and prices for farm products. A tax on land values only would do just that, and no other tax would be needed.

Aberdeen, S.D.

CHARLES J. LAVERY, M.D.

"The progress of rivers to the ocean is not so rapid as that of man to error."—VOLTAIRE.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

ALEXANDER HAMILTON of Victoria, B. C., writes: "Have just received your magazine for May-June and was thrilled with Comment and Reflection. It reads like inspiration; would that all could see and understand it."

HON. P. FRANK MORROW, of the Washington State Senate, writes: "The people of this State have been made tax conscious through the enactment of a vicious sales tax by the last legislature." Mr. Morrow bewails the lack of efficient organization among Single Taxers of the State.

"I LIKE your Comment and Reflection, especially what you say of the NRA farce," writes Philip Kleinschmidt of Leadville, Col.

THE Bridgeport, Conn. *Post* of June 13, prints letters from John C. Rose, Joseph R. Carroll and H. W. Noren in reply to G. R. Ouch who couches a lance in opposition to the Single Tax.

WE are sorry to announce the death on June 21 of William A. Black of San Antonio, Texas, for many years the foremost Single Tax leader in that State, and former member of the State Legislature. His letters and articles were frequent in the newspapers throughout Texas. His widow has expressed a desire to continue this work if she can get the cooperation of Single Taxers in the State. Mr. Black was seventy-seven years old and leaves besides his widow a seventeen year old son. He came to San Antonio in 1905 from Kansas City where he practised law.

FREDERICK VERINDER of London has just completed a new book on the progress of the Single Tax, to be accompanied by a special appendix giving a record of legislative advances in our direction in New Zealand, Australia; South Africa, Canada, Denmark, Northern Nigeria, Malay and other countries.

DR. JAMES H. DILLARD of the University of Virginia, writes: "I have known three really great men, men who were great in themselves, not men who were counted great because of some high position they held. They were John Fiske, Henry George and Booker Washington."

GEORGE HUGHES of Topeka, Kan., writes: "Foley's Questions and Answers I found to be of remarkable value."

IN a letter recently received from Will Atkinson, which want of space will not permit us to print, he tells us that he is writing a series of papers stressing the need of recognition of natural laws. He says: "We cannot abolish competition but we can and must abolish the man-made restrictions on competition caused by privilege."

ED. DORY of Cleveland is sometimes caustic but always interesting. He writes: "I see that Grace Isabel Colbron idly scribbling on her menu card at the recent dinner in New York wrote, Separate assessment (of land and improvements) is the beginning of tax wisdom. That just isn't so. We have had separate assessments in Ohio since 1851 and tax wisdom has never had a toe-hold in Ohio. I do not cry separate assessment. Without it there can be no tax wisdom and with it there is none."

DR. C. J. LAVERY of Aberdeen, S.D., speaking of the Henry George Congress to be held in New York in September: "We who know our fundamentals should take advanced ground in presenting method, method and yet more method. The people of Missouri are not the only ones who have to be shown. One concrete example like shift-

ing all taxes from transportation facilities to land values, in exchange for a substantial cut, about fifty per cent, in carrying charges would show everybody the practical value of the Henry George philosophy better than anything else."

HENRY WARE ALLEN, of Wichita, Kan., writes congratulating us on our birthday and gives us the following hopeful outlook:

I understand that Mr. George was well satisfied with the progress made at the time of his death and I can testify that when it comes to conversations with the average man his philosophy is almost invariably accepted with but little hesitation. This being true I believe now as Henry George did during his life time that the lump has been leveled and that when the philosophy is put to practice on a large scale it will spread like wildfire.

CITY SOLICITOR WARD BONSALE of Pittsburgh, close friend and legal adviser to Mayor McNair, is dead of heart attack. A Single Taxer for many years and active in governmental work, his death is a severe loss to the McNair administration. Mayor McNair says of him, "He was an able lawyer and a man of very high character. He served the city well and I am at a loss to know where I can find any one to replace him." Mr. Bonsall was sixty-one. He leaves a wife, Mrs. Adrienne C. Bonsall, and a son and daughter. For Mr. Bonsall's post John M. Henry, well-known Single Taxer, is being considered.

THE California legislature during the recent session voted the highest volume of taxes ever levied upon Californians. This highest budget in the history of the State amounted to \$376,656,299.

THE announcement of the death of Father J. O. S. Huntington at the age of eighty recalls a devoted friend of the movement who in the old Academy of Music in 1886 and 1887, as well as at the Henry George Congress in this city, appeared in clerical garb to propound the economic gospel of the author of "Progress and Poverty."

OUR old yet ever active friend Frank G. Anderson, of Jamestown, N. Y. in *Skandia*, a local Swedish newspaper of that city, explains in a two-column article the doctrine we hold. The heading of Mr. Anderson's article translated into English is "The Taxation System Must Be Made Just."

DAN BEARD's eighty-fifth birthday was honored by letters of congratulations from Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mr. Beard celebrated his birthday by throwing tomakawks at Indian war posts.

M. S. ENGLEMAN of Dallas, Texas, failing to receive the May-June issue of this paper, wrote in: "How's a fellow to get along without LAND AND FREEDOM?"

JOHN M. MILLER of South Egremont, Mass., wants the names and addresses of Single Taxers in his neighborhood. Will those who note this get into communication with him?

HON. P. FRANK MORROW of Seattle, Wash., continues active in the good work. He spoke at the Open Forum which meets at the Meeves Cafeteria to about one hundred persons, and at the Old Age Club at Moose Hall to nearly 600, and again at the King's County Democratic Club.

OLIVER SMITH in the issue of *Liberty* of June 15 says of Naslund's "The Voice of Verdun" that it is "a war story far above the average."

BILLY RADCLIFFE, N. T. (which initials stand for "no taxes") now in his eighty-fifty year, gets a lot of satisfaction in attending the Henry George School in Cleveland.