

November—December, 1935

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

*An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901*

## What to Emphasize in Teaching Henry George

Benjamin W. Berger at Henry George Congress

## The Story of Tax Relief for Land

Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown

## Where the Wealth Goes

Henry W. Hardinge

## Reviews of Albert J. Nock's "Our Enemy the State" and Col. Rule's "Chaining the War God"

By Harry Weinberger and Frank Chodorov

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.

## NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 6 WHOLE NO. 193

### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

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.....	179
THE SINGLE TAX (Concluded).....Henry George	181
WHAT TO EMPHASIZE IN TEACHING HENRY GEORGE .....Benjamin W. Burger	184
ADDRESS OF CHARLES O'CONNOR HENNESSY AT THE HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS.....	188
KEYNOTE CONVENTION SPEECH OF 1940 (Concluded) .....Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown	191
ACROSS THE COUNTRY WITH JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE.....	196
EXTENSION CLASSES OF THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL	197
REPORT OF ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION .....Antoinette Kaufmann	198
BEGINNING OF THE HENRY GEORGE FELLOWSHIP .....Helen D. Denbigh	199
ARTHUR MADSEN AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS....	200
TRIBUTES TO HENRY GEORGE FROM HALL OF FAME ELECTORS.....	201
WHAT THEY ARE SAYING.....	202
WHERE THE WEALTH GOES.....Henry H. Hardinge	203
BOOK REVIEWS.....	204
CORRESPONDENCE.....	206
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	209

## 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

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1935

No. 6

## Comment and Reflection

THERE has long been a suspicion among a large portion of the public that there is little essential difference between the Republican and Democratic parties. It is doubtful if the Roosevelt policies have materially altered the relationship, at least to the point of providing any marked contrast. From many of the eminent figures in the Republican party have come condemnation more or less qualified. The N R A and the A A A have been adversely criticized, but we miss any very clear distinction between the policies of the two parties on matters of principle. Any clear cut division seems still to be lacking.

OF course the absence of a substitute policy, or a principle, that would answer uneasy inquiry and supplant the prevailing policy of the Washington administration, is the explanation of the futility of the opposition and the assurance of Republican defeat in 1936. The Republicans can only hope to win by a forthright presentation of a substitute philosophy of government for the prevailing one. It is not enough to hack at the edges of the strange edifice while conceding the validity of its foundations and the theories of its architects. Something more than that is required of the adversary.

DISRAELI'S famous aphorism that "It is the function of an opposition to oppose," is not all the story. No purely negative criticism is sufficient to win victory in a far-flung election. Here is the strength of the Roosevelt policies, namely the weakness of the opposition. It may safely be depended upon to win the election for him in 1936. It may be said that the differences that divide the parties are those of degree rather than kind. For against the "planned economy" of the administration the Republicans offer no alternative save to let things drift.

THE Democratic party has embarked on a strange and unexplored sea. But if it does not know its destination its sails are set and it appears to be going somewhere. There is a great fanfare on deck and even some cheering in the hold. They may be drifting on the rocks. But the opposition, on the other hand, has no destination of its own and knows not the whereabouts of the lighthouse.

LET us abandon this crude metaphor for the moment. The Republican party is bankrupt; the Democratic party is not bankrupt so long as it can circulate its spurious coins and get people to take them. And people will take them. Do not make any mistake about that, and do not imagine that the basest kind of political coins will not be preferred to none at all. If the Democratic coins are counterfeit, as we believe they are, they will pass current for quite a while, long enough at least to fool an ill-informed electorate.

LET us imagine the New Deal edifice as utterly demolished. Not one stone remains upon another—the space is cleared for the erection of a new edifice. The Republican architects will not tell us what they propose to build on the site. It is not enough to call Roosevelt socialistic, or to point with alarm at his spending programme. That is alarming enough in all truth but it is at least a programme, if an insane one, and people are not afraid of names. Half of the people cannot tell you what socialism is, not even the Socialists themselves.

NOR are the people afraid of insanity. A large portion of the people are insane upon matters of which they know nothing, and these include economics and government. When and if twelve million people sign petitions for the Townsend Plan (so runs the estimate, true or false) the milder insanity of the Roosevelt party will not lack millions of adherents. And if there should be temporary return of prosperity Roosevelt will get the credit for it and will be triumphantly elected. There will be enough people insane or uniformed to accomplish that.

THE issue on which the two parties may be expected to divide in 1936 is the new system by which it is proposed to supplant the American system of constitutional government which has had the sanction of the American people for one hundred and fifty years. That might seem sufficient to create a real division of American sentiment. But it seems to connote a strange partnership. Jeffersonian democracy and Republican protectionism do not readily mix, and as yet the Republican party shows no disposition to attack the Rooseveltian policies on fundamental differences—in other words, it



does not confront the administration with any policy that assures coalescence.

THE hopelessness of any rational "line up" is evidenced in the confusion which prevails in the Republican opposition. Mr. Frank Knox, proprietor of the *Chicago Daily News*, who is spoken of as a possible candidate against the administration, is an economically ill-informed gentleman who would supplant the AAA with prohibitive tariffs and export bounties! And with these discarded weapons—discarded by every well equipped student of economics—it is proposed to advance against the well-drilled forces of the administration armed, politically at least, with every advantage of position and securely entrenched in power. It looks like a hopeless struggle.

AND there is something else to be considered. Hungry men are not to be attracted by policies which, good or bad, do not touch them directly. Roosevelt has nearly all the promises, and a little turn in prosperity will do the trick for them. He said over the radio the other day: "We have turned the corner. This is not mere chance nor the ending of a cycle. We planned it." (We quote now from memory.) Already he is claiming it. If it even temporarily succeeds, Mr. Knox's plan for prohibitive tariffs and export bounties have small chance of attracting the voter. The cry will then be to let well enough alone.

THERE is as much economic ignorance in one party as in the other. You cannot fight ignorance with ignorance; you can only fight ignorance with knowledge. There is little to choose between Hoover and Roosevelt and less between Knox and Roosevelt. If this is to be the division the election of Roosevelt is assured. His bag of promises is still not exhausted and in the prevailing state of ignorance a slight turn in prosperity, though with the inevitable depression awaiting at the end, the cry of "We planned it" will be enough.

THE way to meet restrictions is not with further restriction. The appeal is to liberty. And the signs of reassurance as to the coming of liberty, though not visible in the political horizon, are gratifyingly plentiful among intellectuals everywhere. In the flood of books now taxing the time of those who read at all, Henry George is coming into his own. The times are ours. Slowly but surely we are breaking through. One of the keenest observers of the modern trend is Leslie Eichel, columnist for several hundred papers, who said recently: "As the New Deal staggers on, unsuccessful in its attempts to re-employ men, and as critics assault it with nothing to offer in its stead, the Henry George group of economists slowly push forward."

THERE is something vividly impressive in this march of a great idea, something that not only stirs a confidence in its early triumph, but a faith that is profound and deeper still. That is a faith in the orderly processes of the natural law in society. The cry of "God will it" heard in the old Anti Poverty days may be heard again. God has not forgotten his children. And if this movement set in motion by Henry George is now in its second stage it is none the less divinely ordered and in harmony with the law of justice which is the law of God. It will not be sensed by every one, even by many who accept the philosophy, but to others it will be clear that we are preparing the way for a civilization greater and more glorious than any of which we dream.

DO we claim too much for what appears to some as a mere change in taxation? If it were only that it would in truth be that we claim too much. But it is not that—not that alone surely. It was Goethe who said that the highest cannot be spoken in words. Truth is revealed in vision and to the eyes of the spirit. Imagine a world where there is no poverty, no wars, no national jealousies, only a world made free and intensively emulative. We may then be on the threshold of solution to other problems which we have little time to consider, too harassed to pause, too far removed from the experiences of the soul which are in the nature of divine intimations known but to the strangely gifted. The human race is not only the heir of all the ages, but is the inheritor of the future whose revelations, as the wise Goethe has told us, cannot be spoken in words, but are reserved only for a race made materially and spiritually free.

TO descend a moment but proceeding along what after all is the same line of thought, do we ever stop to think that the new world made possible by the far reaching change for which we contend will render obsolete much of the world's twisted morals, the eccentricities of many religious faiths, and also a great deal of the world's literature, some of its poetry, and great tomes of its philosophies?

SOME of the followers of Henry George will feel a keen sense of disappointment that our distinguished leader has failed of election to the Hall of Fame. This disappointment we cannot share. It took some time for Edgar Allan Poe, the most distinctive of American poets to crash the gates of the Hall of Fame, perhaps because he was fond of whiskey and needed very little to render him either inspired or helpless. We are reminded of Abraham Lincoln's answer to complaints that General Grant drank heavily. He said, as our readers will recall that he would like to know the brand of whiskey Grant favored that he might recommend it to others of his



generals. In the same way the kind of whiskey indulged by Poe might be recommended to some of the so-called poets who clutter the magazines with their almost incomprehensible verse.

THIS merely by way of digression. Sixty-one votes were required to elect. Henry George received twenty-six, or five less than needed. A short fifty years have elapsed since Henry George was denounced by the "savants of society" and the conservative element everywhere as an anarchist and a dangerous enemy of the Commonwealth. Much water has passed under the bridge since then. Fifty-six out of one hundred and one eminent educators, authors, scientists, and public men representing every State in the Union, have signified their desire that this once despised printer and "agitator" be enshrined among the immortals. This is a great advance the world moves. His defeat by so narrow a margin, a victory for human intelligence and five years from now there will be another election. In the meantime his name is secure and growing.

## The Single Tax\*

By HENRY GEORGE

(Concluded)

TO give an illustration, let us suppose that a man of great wealth and benevolence, wishing to help a number of poor people, erects a building of many apartments. He stores the cellars with coal; he secures a supply of water; and he so adapts the building that elevators may be put in, and heat, light and water, and power be conducted through it. He does not wish to become a special providence to these men, for that would be to make and keep them babies. He wishes them, by doing for themselves, to develop manly qualities and to learn to live together. So admitting a certain number to the building, and providing for the future coming of others, he leaves them at liberty to manage as they please.

The donor of the building asks no revenue; he has made a free gift. But the tenants will need a revenue, since some of them must be occupied in taking care of the house, making improvements from time to time, and in doing other things for the common benefit.

Now, the proper way of raising this revenue will be clear—so clear that it will be certain to whoever considers it that the donor could have intended no other. And this way will appear as soon as the tenants come to settle the occupancy among themselves. Though for a day or two after they enter into possession they may

treat the house as common, yet they will soon discover the necessity for definite location. The question of how the apartments shall be assigned among them will thus come up. If all the apartments were alike, and if the matter of location with respect to other tenants made no difference, equality might be assured by letting each take an apartment leaving the unoccupied ones for newcomers. But the apartments are not all alike, and location in respect to other occupants is a matter of importance, especially since the erection of elevators, the distribution of heat, power, electricity, etc., could not be made all at once, but would come first in the best-tenanted parts of the house. The most desirable apartments would therefore command premiums. To collect these premiums for the common expenses would be the obvious way both to put all the tenants on a level with regard to the bounty of their benefactor and to provide for common needs and improvements. Under this system there would be no levy on any individual. There would be only a single tax, collected from the occupants of the more desirable rooms. No one would be taxed for living in the building or for having an apartment, for every one would be free without the payment of any premium, to take any apartment that no one else wanted. It would be only to the use of rooms of more than ordinary desirability that the payment of a premium would be a condition.

In this way as the new tenants came in, in accordance with the benefactor's will, they would, until the house was really full, find ample room on equal terms with those already there, and in this way all the common expenses and the costs of making improvements could be met. As the tenants increased in number and improvements were made, the relative desirability of the apartments might change. Some that at first were most desirable and paid the highest premiums might become of only ordinary desirability and cease to bring any premium while the upper stories, that at first no one cared to live in, might, when the elevators got running, seem most desirable and pay the highest premiums. But the aggregate premiums would increase with increase of numbers and the making of improvements, and a larger and larger common fund be available for common purposes.

Now this is the way of the Single Tax—the method which we Single Tax men would apply to that house of which we are all tenants.

But another way MIGHT be adopted. If such tenants were to do as we of the United States have done, they would let a few of their number claim the apartments as their private property, collect the premiums, and keep the greater part of them. They would let them claim whole blocks of as yet unoccupied apartments, and in the effort to get monopoly and speculative premiums hold them vacant long after those who ought to use them had arrived, compelling the new-comers to go farther upstairs or into the wings, or to sleep in passage-ways, and to wander around unable to find a place to work. They

\*NOTE:—This article, written by Henry George, and published in *The Century*, July, 1890, in answer to the attack, written by Edward Dickinson, entitled "A Single Tax on Land" in the same issue of the magazine, is here reproduced and slightly abridged by Anna George Mille.



would let other grabbers go into the cellars and claim the store of coal as their private property. They would let others claim the water supply, and others take the privilege of putting up the elevators, etc., and charging tolls. And then to supply the place of the proper revenue thus given away they would station guards at each entrance to the building to seize part of everything brought in, and send men nosing about the apartments demanding of each tenant to exhibit all he had, that they might levy toll on it. What liars and perjurers and evaders this system would make; how it would prevent proper improvement, and discourage honest work, and stimulate everything mean and wicked; how it would frustrate the benevolent intention of the builder of the house; how many of the tenants would be miserably poor, while a few could be lavish and lazy. This is our present economic system.

The value of land in cities is higher relative to the value of improvements than in farming districts. Hence it is clear that to abolish all taxes, save a tax on land values, would be to the gain of the farming districts. In such case there is but little real land value, and under the Single Tax such farmers would pay but a small tax. But under the present system they are taxed most heavily. There are taxes on their buildings, their improvements their stock, their furniture, their crops, and in many of our States on their very mortgages—for the tax levied on the mortgagee the mortgagor must pay. Taxes compel them to wear shoddy when they might wear wool, to sleep under quilts and comfortables when they might have blankets, to pay for three bushels of salt or two lumps of sugar in order to get one. From the plow that turns the ground to the machine with which he harvests the crop and the steel rails that carries it to market, from the lumber and nails of his house to the hat on his head, almost everything the farmer uses is increased in cost by taxes that fatten rings, combinations and favored individuals. The American farmer, like Issachar, is a strong ass; but today he is crouching, with almost broken back between two burdens—the burden of land speculation, which makes him pay for land he ought to get for nothing, and the burden of taxation, which wherever else it may not stay put, does stay put when it reaches him. Between the two he is being crushed out. All through the United States the typical American farmer is disappearing, and the tenant, or "blanket man," is taking his place, or the land is relapsing to wilderness.

Those methods of plucking the goose without making it cry, such as indirect taxation, have always proved curses. Without them the wars, the standing armies, the enormous public debts of our modern world would have been impossible. Out of them has come that doctrine of protection that negatives the benefits of invention by raising in hostile tariffs greater obstacles to human intercourse than seas and mountains; that legalizes robbery and

makes piracy pass for patriotism; that teaches so-called Christian people that "they didn't know everything down in Judee," and that the interests of men are not mutual but antagonistic. It is this taxation that maintains the standing armies that prop European thrones with bayonets, and that has made our republic rotter with corruption.

Look at the willful extravagance this system has caused in the United States. Our Federal taxation is kept up for the sake of monopoly. Every proposition of waste has the powerful support of interests that want taxes imposed or maintained to enable them to rob their fellow countrymen; interests whose impudence and pertinacity have actually made many Americans believe that they can get rich by taxing themselves—that the way to help the laborer is to pile burdens on his back. But for this system of indirect taxation we might since the war have paid off every penny of the national debt, and had today nothing but a nominal Federal revenue to raise.

The Single Tax would destroy this vicious system. It would end the pressure to impose and maintain taxes and would enable us to dismiss a horde of officials and bring the Federal Government to its proper simplicity.

The tax on land values would be collected just as it is now, and where improved land was sold for taxes, which would be seldom or never the case, an adjustment could readily be made which would secure the value (not cost) of the improvements to the owner. Land would be more readily improved than now, since it could be had for improvement on easier terms, and the whole value of the improvement would be left to the improver. As the tax was increased speculative or anticipatory values would rapidly disappear, while selling values would diminish and if the tax were pushed to theoretical perfection they would also disappear. But rental or use value would remain. It does not lessen the value of land to the user if what he must pay to the owner is taken from that owner in taxation. If we ever reach the point of theoretical perfection so nearly that selling values disappear, then we shall only have to abandon the American plan of assessing selling values and adopt the English plan of assessing rental or use values. With speculative values gone, and with public attention concentrated on one source of revenue, there could be no difficulty in this.

To reach this point of theoretical perfection, at which land would have no selling value,—i.e., would yield to the mere owner no income,—would be to reach (what Mr. Atkinson himself confesses to be) the ideal. Then labor and capital could be applied to land without any artificial obstruction whatever. They would be free from all taxes on themselves or their products, while they would not have to buy land, but would only pay for its use where peculiar advantages gave them a large return. Even before this point was reached mere owner



ship would cease. Men would not care to own land they did not want to use, and users of land, where their use was more than transient, would become the legal owners, having the assured privilege of peaceable possession and transfer as long as the tax was paid.

How close it might be possible finally to come to the point of theoretical perfection, or whether it would be best to leave such a margin as would give a small selling value, are matters which, like other questions of detail, it is not now necessary to discuss. But in thinking of details it should be remembered that we cannot get to the Single Tax at one leap, but only by gradual steps, which will bring experience to the settlement of details; and that from the abolition of present taxes, and the resulting ease in social conditions, we may expect moral improvements, which will make easier than might now seem possible the fair and full collection of a tax that looks for the use of the community only values due to the progress of the community. Taxes on the products of labor, taxes which take the earnings of industry and the savings of thrift, always have begotten, and always must beget, fraud, corruption, and evasion. All the penalties of the law—imprisonments, fines, torture, and death—have failed to secure their honest and equal collection. They are unjust and unequal in their very nature, always falling on the poor with greater severity than on the rich. Their collection always entails great waste and cost, increases the number of office holders and the complexity of government, and compels interference with individual affairs; always checks production, lessens general wealth, and takes from labor and capital their due reward—the stimulus to productive exertion. Men naturally evade and resist them, and with the sanction of the moral sense even where their duller intellectual faculties are convinced that such taxes are right and beneficial in themselves. There may be protectionists who will not smuggle or undervalue when they get a chance, but I have never met them. There may be rich men who make a true return of their wealth for taxation, but they are very few. Rent, however, is usually a willing payment. It is the strength of landlordism, so outrageously and preposterously unjust, that it appropriates a natural contribution or tax that in itself men recognize as just. For the privilege of occupying a superior location to that of others a man feels that he ought to pay. A while ago it was discovered that a man had been for years collecting rents on some blocks of land belonging to the city in the upper part of New York. Those who paid the rent had not inquired into his ownership. They knew, though perhaps they did not reason it out, that THEY were not entitled to use this superior land any more than other people, and were willing to pay for the advantage they got.

Is there any scarcity of capital? Why, everywhere there is a seeming surplus of labor. Even in what we have become accustomed to think normally good times there are men ready and anxious to labor who cannot

get the opportunity—masses of men wholly or partly unemployed who would gladly be at work. So much is labor in seeming excess of the opportunities to labor that from all parts of the country come requests for laborers to keep away; that we talk and think of work as a thing in itself to be desired and to be "made;" are beginning to keep convicts in idleness or at unproductive labor that honest men may have work; and to take the first steps in shutting out laborers who come from abroad.

With an abundance of capital, with a surplus of labor, —the thing that makes capital,—with a people anxious for more wealth, why is not more wealth produced? Is there any scarcity of land? To ask the question is to answer it. In this country there are as yet but (sixty-five millions\*) of us scattered over a territory that even in the present stage of the arts could support a thousand millions! Any scarcity of land? Go where you will, even in our cities, and you may see unsued land and half-used land—natural opportunities lying idle while labor presses for employment and capital wastes.

What is the cause? Simply that instead of applying economic rent to the purpose for which in the natural order it was intended, we leave it to be a premium and incentive to forestalling and monopoly, while we tax industry. There is no real scarcity of land, but there is an artificial scarcity that has the same effect. Our land is not all in use—we have hardly more than begun to scratch it; but it is practically all fenced in. Wherever labor and capital go to find employment on land they find the speculator ahead of them, demanding a rent or price based not on present development, but on the prospects of future development.

To end all this, to open to labor and capital opportunities of employment bounded only by the desires of men, we have but to conform to the manifest intent of the Builder of the house, to abolish unnatural taxes, and to resort to their natural source for public revenues. On the one hand we would do away with all taxes that now fine industry and thrift, and would give free play to the human factor of production. On the other hand we would break up the monopolization of the natural factor. When economic rent was taken for public use the mere ownership of land would become as profitless as it is sterile. No one would want to own land unless he wanted to use it; and for all who wanted to use land there would be land enough and to spare. With the forces of production thus set free, with the natural and limitless means of production thus opened, who could set bounds to the production of wealth? Were invention and discovery to stop today the productive forces are strong enough to give to the humblest not merely all the necessities, but all the comforts and reasonable luxuries of life with but a moderate amount of labor—to destroy utterly the nightmare of want.

What is poverty?

---

\*Now in 1935 one hundred and twenty million.



Is it not the want of the things that work produces on the part of those willing to do reasonable work. Why is there such want?

I need not point out that while a few of our people have more wealth than is wholesome for men to have,—for great fortunes have been growing here faster than ever before in the world's history,—the masses of our people do not have wealth enough to give them the comforts, the leisure, and the opportunities of development that in this stage of civilization ought to be possible to the humblest; that most of us by working hard merely manage to live, and must stint and strain and worry; that many are becoming criminals, tramps, and paupers, and many are eking out an existence by charity in one form or another; that children die when they ought to live; that women are old and worn when they ought to be in their prime of womanly beauty and charm; that men are aged physically and stunted mentally and morally when they ought to be in the highest development of their faculties; that many who ought to have wives feel too poor to take them; that many who ought to have husbands are cheated out of the fullness of the life for which nature intended them. What a pitiful possibility does this represent for the average American citizen?

We want more wealth. Why, then, do we not produce more? What factor is short? Where is the limitation?

But instead of invention and discovery stopping, they would only have begun. What checks invention and discovery today is poverty; what turns the very blessings they ought to bring to all into curses to great masses is that fundamental wrong which produces that most unnatural and helpless of all objects, the mere laborer—the human being feeling all the wants of a man, having all the powers of a man, yet denied by human laws all access to or right in that element without which it is impossible for human powers to satisfy human wants. To what as yet undreamed-of powers over natural things man may rise, in a state of society where, the forces of production being unhampered and the natural opportunities for production being unmonopolized, there shall be work for all, leisure for all, opportunities of full development for all, the inventions and discoveries of the century just closing afford but hints.

The cause of poverty is not in human nature; it is not in the constitution of the physical world; it is not in the natural laws of social growth. It is in the injustice which denies to men their natural rights; in the stupidity which diverts from its proper use the value which attaches to land with social growth, and then imposes on industry and thrift taxes which restrain production and put premiums on greed and dishonesty; injustice and stupidity which ignores the true rights of property and turn governments into machines by which the unscrupulous may rob their neighbors.

## What to Emphasize in Teaching the Philosophy of Henry George

BENJAMIN W. BURGER OF NEW YORK CITY  
AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS

I HAVE often wondered why a reform, eminently just as ours, should be so long delayed in finding common acceptance. Looking back over the pages of history at other great reforms, now happily accomplished, the mystery becomes more understandable.

Chattel slavery, the ownership of one human being by another, was abolished in this country a short seventy years ago. As we look back, we wonder how anyone could have justified slavery. Yet we know that not only did it have stout defenders, particularly in the South but men of the cloth quoted Scripture to justify it. Four years' bloody war was necessary to end it in the United States; it has not yet been abolished throughout the world. In Ethiopia, Arabia, Liberia and Central Asia there are today 5,000,000 slaves.

Today we look back upon slavery as an obvious evil and wonder why a handful of delegates from the slave and free states, sitting around a table, could not amicably have arranged to abolish it without the terrible expense misery and suffering of prolonged warfare. Human slavery, we say, was an obvious evil. But no more obvious than the present industrial slavery which permits a small number, purporting to own the earth, (which is not a product of human labor and therefore cannot be owned) to rent it to us before we may live and work.

The obvious things in life escape us. The disenfranchisement of woman, another obvious evil, was abolished only after years of persistent agitation. What more obvious than that women are affected by the political, social, and economic conditions surrounding them, and therefore have an *inherent right* to participate in making laws? Yet it required one hundred years intensive agitation to secure this simple right. There are still millions of men, and women too, who look with disfavor upon woman suffrage. That women have not yet made the best use of their newly acquired right is beside the point. They have a right, an *inherent right*, with their brothers, fathers and husbands, to determine the conditions under which they live and work and raise their children. They had to fight long and hard to acquire that right. In the same way, we wonder how cannibalism, and other terrible practices of our hoary past could be defended. Yet we know there were those who justified them, every one; cannibalism, slavery, witchcraft, woman disenfranchisement, absolute monarchies and, in modern times, war, religious strife, race hatred, vaccination, capital punishment, misappropriation of land rent, and many other wrongs.

How can we explain this? Well, one answer is that



he obvious is not always obvious to those who live in the midst of the evil to be corrected; the obvious is not always obvious to those who participate in the evil, and are its immediate beneficiaries. Only a handful, fired with the divine faculty of imagination, conceive a world free from injustice, strife, suffering.

\* \* \*

Fate has ever been unkind to rebels against injustice. Most people, even if uncomfortable, object to being disturbed. They are victims of inertia. Their attitude, sub-consciously, is, "if you ask me to work, I'll hate you; if you ask me to think, I'll kill you."

Our reform must contend with still another difficulty. It is a fundamental reform. It is truly radical in that it probes down to root causes. *We assert that those who labor shall receive the fruits of their labor.* We fear not to be called radicals. Anyone who knows his Latin knows that the word radical comes from the Latin *radix* meaning root. (A radish, for example, is a root vegetable.) What more rational way to correct an evil than to probe down to its root causes? For it is only as you abolish root causes that you truly cure.

Imagine a dentist trying to cure a toothache due to an infected root by polishing the crown, or filling the cavity, and ignoring the root condition. The great revolution in medicine during the past half century has been in the field of ascertaining and removing root causes of disease. The wise physician no longer prescribes pills for headaches or stomach-aches; or operations for internal disorders. He seeks to ascertain the *causes* of the headaches or disorders. By removing these causes he knows the effects will, in due time, disappear, provided, of course, there have been no organic changes.

In criminology, we have not yet learned this great truth. An economic system, under which we must surrender part of our wealth for mere permission to live and work on the earth is a system which deprives men and women of their *inherent right* to earn their daily bread and forces many into crime. Then the law condemns the victims instead of correcting the conditions which produce them. "The Law," said Charles Dickens, "is an ass."

We have then the indisputable fact that our reform is fundamental, and most people lack the patience and ability to think problems through to their basic causes. Palliation is quicker. Fundamental reform takes too long. (Curiously, while few can see the relationship between the misappropriation of our land rent and involuntary poverty, the first objection they hurl at us when we present our philosophy is, "How will your system abolish poverty?")

The inability of people to think the problem of political economy through from cause to effect explains the vogue of Socialism which expends itself in palliating the *effects* of poverty instead of ascertaining and abolishing its

cause. Socialists offer as plasters to ease the pains of poverty, caused by injustice, maternity insurance, old age pensions, workmen's compensation, state milk for babies, inheritance and income taxes, and nostrums to share wealth.

*To stop those who claim to own our earth from robbing both Labor and Capital is no essential part of the Socialist Platform.* They would rather treat fifty limbs of a tree than cure the diseased roots. Socialists fail to see that two factors produce wealth, while three factors divide it, AND THAT if they stopped that basic wrong, there would be no need for their little palliatives. That the Socialists do not recognize the fundamental importance of the land question will be readily apparent when we examine their platforms, city, state, and national. Some years they advocate the public appropriation of land rent; other years they ignore it. Their stock in trade is protestation, denunciation, and palliation.

\* \* \*

Essentially, we believe in freedom; freedom for the individual to express himself, limited only by the equal freedom of every other individual. The supreme value of mankind is the human individual, and the human individual can realize himself only in free and creative co-operation with his fellows. Only in a free society can men produce most efficiently, most abundantly, and express their noblest selves. Our viewpoint is that of Diogenes, who, when asked by Alexander what the King could do for him, proudly replied, "Only keep out of my sunlight."

Today, liberty has been surrendered by 500,000,000 people, to whom Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin and other dictators falsely have promised economic security. "The love of liberty," wrote Hazlitt, "is the love of others; the love of power is the love of ourselves." We perceive that freedom must be a chimera where a few can charge the many rent for our common mother, the Earth. Now, the Socialists believe that government may become a good substitute for freedom. Let the Great Father at Washington, or Albany or at the New York City Hall mail us \$200 Townsend checks on the first of each and every month; or proffer us cash when we are unemployed, or arbitrarily fix prices for food, rent, and wages, say the Socialists. We believe these attempts to interfere with natural law must fail, and failing, must lead to coercion, because, basically, they are unsound.

The present government at Washington shares the Socialist's viewpoint. When Mrs. Roosevelt, an excellent woman, observes the West Virginia coal miners living amidst squalor and poverty and lacking the necessities of life, she says, "Let's transfer these unhappy people to more congenial surroundings. Let's send them to the country or ship them to Alaska." It never occurs to her whether they will be more successful in their new surroundings, nor why they have been unable to earn a



living in their old surroundings, which just as sadly cry out for development. It never dawns upon her that land values are going to arise in the new locations whence these people, like cattle, have been shipped, which will enable a few to rob industry of the biggest part of its wages. These land values are going to be a liability to the new settlers, and a first charge on their industry, and an asset only to those who, legally, may misappropriate them. *Mrs. Roosevelt never advocates abolishing the system under which a few, purporting to own the earth get something for nothing, with the result that producers get nothing for something. Mrs. Roosevelt never advocates the Georgian system under which, by collecting our publicly created land rent and applying it to our public needs, and abolishing taxation, we would, in effect, establish each and every human being's equal right to live on this earth without paying tribute to any landlord.*

"The rich will do everything for the poor," wrote Tolstoi, "except get off their backs."

\* \* \*

Like Boston, which has been called a state of mind, our philosophy can find acceptance only in a well ordered mind. It can be grasped only by those who love liberty for her own sake; who sense a Divine order in the Universe; who can understand fundamental principles in the realm of political economy; who are familiar with the history of government; who agree with Jefferson, that that government is best which governs least; who can reason from cause to effect.

Herbert Spencer truly said that it required a high type of human being to make democracy a success. Our philosophy can succeed only when there are men and women of fine feeling, possessing what educators call "a sense of awareness;" men and women who can distinguish between "mine and thine" on one hand, and "ours" on the other; *for we see things not as they are, but as we are.*

True to the character of his philosophy, Henry George was a deeply reverential being; considerate, kindly patient with those who differed with him; serene in adversity, at all times radiating sweetness and light.

Karl Marx, the founder of modern Socialism, was his antithesis. Marx was opposed to religion, calling it an opiate to keep the masses in poverty; (this is the slogan of his present day Russian disciples.) He was embittered, sour at humanity, intolerant of criticism, and preached the terrible doctrine of class hatred.

\* \* \*

To understand the Georgeist philosophy requires a new orientation, or new viewpoint. In ancient times, men built their temples so that the worshippers at the altar should face the rising sun. As the worshippers prayed, their faces were suffused with the sun's rays. The location of a structure thus to face the sun eventually came to be defined by the verb, "to orient." Hence

the noun "orientation" was developed as significant of articulation with, and adjustment to one's environment.

What do I mean when I say one must be properly orientated before one can grasp political economy? I mean he must understand its fundamentals: he must grasp his relationship to the globe on which he lives, and from which he draws his sustenance. *He must recognize that this globe lacks the characteristics of private property.*

Six qualities distinguish land from private property.

1. The earth on which we live was not produced by any human being, but is the gift of the Creator for the equal use of 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 land-owners choose to put on it.

5. It owes its value entirely to the presence and activities of the community.

6. It cannot be carried away or concealed.

These are, indeed, unique qualities.

*It is significant that no form of individually created wealth possesses a single one of these characteristics.*

\* \* \*

The position of mankind today with reference to political economy is analogous to that of the human race in the 15th century with reference to astronomy.

Until the discoveries of Copernicus, it was believed that our earth was the center of the universe; that the earth stood still while the heavenly bodies revolved around it. With the publication of Copernicus's work in 1543, man learned his *true position* in the universe. He discovered that the earth was only a tiny speck of dust in the universe; one of the many specks of dust traveling around the sun, which is over a million times as big as the earth, and is *itself* only a grain of sand in the vastness of space. It was not until man learned his true position in the universe that he was able to make real strides in the science of astronomy. Likewise, he will not be able to advance in the science of political economy until he has been properly orientated, that is, until he has acquired perspective.

What are the essential elements we must establish for the public collection and public expenditure of land rent? Since the problem is not unlike a problem in law, let us examine an analogy from that field. If, for example, A sues B for damages, claiming misrepresentation, A can recover only if he proves five essential points:

1. That B made certain representations to A, orally or in writing.

2. That these representations were statements of fact, not merely expressions of opinion.

3. That B made these representations to induce A to act upon them.



4. That, in fact, A did act upon them.
5. That A suffered damages as a result.

Unless A proves each and every one of these five points, his case fails.

Now, it happens that the points which we must prove to establish our case for the public appropriation of ground rent also are five in number.

First, it seems to me, we must convincingly show that we live on the earth; that out of that earth, labor must fashion its habitations, whether rude huts or the most magnificent palaces; on that earth, men must lovingly tend their animals, in order that they may have meat and drink, leather and wool; on that earth, labor must tickle the soil to grow fruits, vegetables and grains; over that earth man must operate trains, ships, and automobiles to transport themselves and their products; under the waters of that earth they must operate submarines, and in the air airplanes; on that earth, teachers, doctors, lawyers, preachers, newspapermen, actors, and a thousand other trades and professions must minister to the efficiency, comfort, mental and spiritual advancement of those who toil on the earth.

*In short, the first point we must convincingly establish, is that man, in his physical aspects, at least, is a land animal, chained to this ball called the earth, his activities limited to the earth, at death, the elements constituting his body again returning to earth.*

"Dust thou art, to dust returnest."

You say this is obvious?

Speak to the first ten men you meet, and learn with astonishment how many consider land no longer essential to their existence; indeed they are uncertain that their needs must be satisfied from land. They fail to perceive that employment requires use of land.

"We don't need land any more," they will tell you, "we live in cities, in six-story buildings."

\* \* \*

"Why, you can get all the land you want for nothing, out West," they tell you.

Socialists, Technocrats and Communists glibly speak of machines "manufacturing clothing and shoes," and becoming so efficient that "human labor soon will become unnecessary." (Of course, no machine ever produced anything. All a machine does is to aid labor, transform raw material taken out of the earth, into shapes, forms, colors, and conditions suitable for human needs.) It comes as a distinct surprise to Socialists that every brick, column, piece of stone, bit of glass composing a building was fashioned by labor from materials extracted from the earth; that every bit of food which we eat is nothing but land that has been transformed by the alchemy of nature into a condition suitable for human consumption, and that every job requires access to land. No one can clearly perceive our philosophy unless and until he recognizes his utter dependency on the planet to which he is

chained, and from which, by his labor, every moment, he draws his food and bodily covering, and has his being.

In Brooklyn, a few years ago, the Socialists seriously informed me that machinery and factories now were more important than land. If they lived on the ground, in tents, they might agree that land was essential; living instead in six-story tenements, they are not quite certain they use the earth. It signifies little to them that the tenements rest on ground.

Likewise, if every morning, chicken-like, they had to go out and scratch the ground for their food, they would clearly see that all food is produced by labor applied to earth; using bottled milk and can openers, they have a hazy notion it somehow comes from dairies and factories.

We place the emphasis on the essential, land; they place the emphasis on the non-essential, capital. Henry George rightly said that the trouble with Socialism was that it was not radical; it failed to reach down to root causes.

The *second point* we must establish is that all human beings have an equal right to live on this earth, or, as the Declaration of Independence phrases it, "an unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Since the American and French revolutions, this point has not been so hotly disputed, although there are still many who practise the contrary. Witness our discriminations against our black brothers; discrimination against Jews, and Catholics; lynchings, race riots, Ku Klux Klans, Russian pogroms, German anti-Semitism.

The basis for the assertion of human equality is that every human being, *because he is a human being*, has indefeasible worth, and therefore is entitled to honor and respect. True, a human being may fail to exhibit his wonderful qualities; he may, in fact, express his worst side, but, *potentially*, we recognize in every human being divine qualities which we are to elicit, for, *as we elicit them in others, we thereby release these divine possibilities within ourselves*. This point has been especially developed by religion and ethics.

(To recapitulate: First we must prove that the earth is indispensable for man's existence. Secondly, that all men have an equal right to live on the earth.)

The *third point*, a corollary, flows from these two points; namely, the earth cannot be privately owned, any more than the air or the sunshine, or the flowing rivers, or the mighty mountains, and each generation has only a right to use the earth, and cannot foreclose succeeding generations from their equal right to use it.

The *fourth point*, that land rent, a differential, measures the desirability of different locations, presents a problem of inductive reasoning, in the science of political economy.

The *fifth point*, in my opinion the most difficult to establish to the satisfaction of beginners, is this: By using ground rent for our common needs, and abolishing taxation, we, in effect, establish each and every human being's equal right to live.



*When, and only when, we have satisfactorily established each and every one of these five points, have we proved our case.*

\* \* \*

Long before Henry George, thousands of years ago, in fact, wise philosophers, great religious teachers, and deep thinkers in the realm of political economy had perceived that our earth, because of its unique nature, could not be private property, like buildings, suits of clothes, or food, which labor produces.

Henry George's contribution to the solution of the age-old problem of want in the midst of plenty, consisted of this:

He showed how, by applying land rent for our common needs, and abolishing taxation, we, in effect, established the inherent right of every human being to live equally with every other human being. Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, among others, had missed this vital point.

I have already indicated the importance of a sound understanding of fundamental politico-economic principles. It requires a thorough comprehension of wealth, how it is produced, and how it is distributed, to grasp the philosophy of Henry George. Especially, it requires a clear conception of the definitions of the terms of political economy; land, labor, capital, interest, wages, rent. Henry George devoted one chapter of twenty-six pages in "Progress and Poverty" to defining the terms he was about to use, before setting out to solve the problem of the unjust distribution of wealth. Geometry, which like political economy, is an exact science, first defines the terms to be employed and sets forth its axioms and postulates before offering its problems for solution.

How can we explain our philosophy to the Socialists, for example, who include land monopoly in the term, "capital;" or to the man in the street, to whom, "landlord" signifies only the individual who owns the building in which he lives, who in many cases, has leased the ground, and is not a *land* owner; or the term rent, which to the man in the street, connotes the payment he will be called upon to make on the first of next month, solely, he believes, for the three-room apartment he occupies? He has never paused to think that land has a value separate, and distinct, and apart from the improvements in, on, or above it.

Or the terms, wealth and property, in which most persons include also land; or the term real estate, which includes two such diverse elements as land, placed here by the Creator, and improvements on land, produced by the labor of human beings? Or the term profits, which as commonly used, may signify wages, interest, rent, any two, or all three? Ask the next person who talks about, "production without profit," which of these he has in mind.

It is of vital importance then, if we would be under-

stood, that the terms of political economy mean exactly the same to our listeners as they mean to us. How far would I get, in solving a problem in geometry for you, if you understood a triangle to be a four-sided figure? Or, suppose I, speaking only English, tried to convey a thought to you, speaking only Spanish, how far would I get? The story of an American in Spain, in this situation, is pertinent. Being very thirsty, after a hot summer's day's journey on foot, the American sought a glass of milk; unable to make known his wants in the vernacular, he drew on the bill of fare the picture of a cow. Within two minutes, the Spanish waiter returned with tickets for a bull fight. (Incidentally, this bears out what I have previously said, about seeing things, not as they are, but as *we are*.)

\* \* \*

Believing that Henry George correctly formulated the laws governing the production and distribution of wealth, the HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE has been chartered, under the Laws of the State of New York, to teach the science of political economy. We confidently believe that the student who familiarizes himself with the simple laws of that science, cannot help become an advocate of the Georgeian philosophy.

"Correct thought," wrote Henry George, "must precede right action. Where there is correct thought, right action will follow."

## Address of Charles O'Connor Hennesy PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR FREE TRADE AND LAND VALUE TAXATION

HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, SEPTEMBER 27

**I**T seems to me very fitting that a gathering of the professed followers of Henry George, wherever held should devote some part of its proceedings to the international aspect of Henry George's philosophy.

This is particularly true at this time, when, because of recent events in Europe and in Africa, the civilized world is confronted with the actual prospect of a new World War, more terrible in its implications than that which only a few years ago brought death to millions of human beings, and grief and misery unparalleled to countless other millions throughout the world.

Henry George considered himself a citizen of the world. The concept of freedom which is at the base of his teachings, meant to him freedom for men everywhere under the sun. We know that he did not esteem mere political freedom for which men in all lands have striven mightily as essentially important unless the proceeds of government served to arrive at economic freedom. Without the establishment of economic freedom in producing wealth, and justice in its distribution, he predicted that



increasing wealth in any land must benefit the few rather than the many. Free governments, even when democratically controlled, would, without economic freedom, have no tendency to extirpate poverty and the social evils which poverty engenders and no influence in elevating society as a whole, or in lightening the burdens of those compelled to toil for a living.

It seems to us as students of Henry George, that there is an inevitable relationship and interdependence between the causes of war and those causes that produce periodical industrial depressions and widespread poverty in all lands. George realized this nearly sixty years ago, and recently, as some of you may know, his daughter, Anna George de Mille, resurrected a remarkable but forgotten passage in an address which her father made in which he forecast the idea of a league of nations that forty years later was called into being by the vision of a President of the United States. Here in his own words is the vision of Henry George in 1877:

"It is too soon to hope that it may be the mission of this Republic to unite all nations of English speech whether they grow beneath the Northern star or Southern cross, in a League, which, by insuring justice, promoting peace, and liberating commerce, will be the forerunner of a world wide federation that will make war the possibility of a past age and turn to works of usefulness the enormous forces now dedicated to destruction."

Let me repeat for emphasis, Henry George's vision of an International League:

"which, by insuring justice, promoting peace, and liberating commerce, will be the forerunner of a world wide federation that will make war the possibility of a last age, and turn to works of usefulness the enormous forces now dedicated to destruction."

This may recall to some of you the language of Locksley Hall, that noble poem of Tennyson with his notable prophecy of the ultimate coming into being of a "Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World." Only today I was told at the New York Public Library that Tennyson's famous poem was not published until 1886, or eight years after the utterance of the noble vision of Henry George.

Our present League of Nations seems to have been the concept of Woodrow Wilson, whose primary idea of putting an end to war through an approach to economic freedom was lost in the shuffle of the treaty makers at Versailles. You will recall that in his Fourteen Points upon which the war Armistice was granted, Wilson contended for

"the removal so far as possible of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all nations consenting to the Peace, and associate themselves for its maintenance."

And now may I recite a little history which particularly relates to the guests from over-seas who are with me on this platform this evening.

Nine years ago, a splendid international gathering of followers of Henry George assembled in the beautiful city of Copenhagen in Denmark, over which I had the great honor to preside. Through the influence of Mr. Folke, one of our guests tonight, who is the splendid leader of the Henry George movement in the Danish kingdom, his government extended extraordinary courtesies and honors to the International Congress of Georgeists there assembled. The Parliament houses were turned over to us, and the government radio station and noted cabinet ministers addressed our meeting.

Subsequently in London, there came into existence the formal organization of the International Union for Free Trade and Land Value Taxation which, in 1929, held another notable conference in Edinburgh. Its formal object may be compressed into this sentence, taken from its Constitution:

"To stimulate in all countries a public opinion favorable to permanent peace and prosperity to all people, through the progressive removal of the basic economic causes of war as these causes are demonstrated in the writings of Henry George."

Now, a year after the great Copenhagen meeting of Georgeists attended by the representatives of twenty-six countries, the Council of the League of Nations at Geneva, issued a call for an economic conference designed to find a way to end the new World War, that is, the economic war that was then and is still going on between the countries which participated in the making of the Treaty of Versailles, which had been ostensibly designed to put an end to the wars of the future. The multiplication of trade barriers, of tariffs and quotas, of import and export restrictions, and other interferences with the basic right of friendly peoples to do business with one another, was not only destroying the possibility of economic recovery but it was generating hates and fears and jealousies and bitterness. These conditions were leading many of the nations to a vast increase of destructive armament, on the sea, on the land, and in the air. "Something must be done about it!" was the idea behind the calling of that first Economic Conference of the League of Nations,—a recognition of the Georgeist contention that the fundamental causes of war are economic in their character.

Well, this young International organization of ours with its headquarters in London, decided not to wait for the unlikely event of an invitation to attend this League of Nations Conference. It prepared an address to Geneva, an address printed in a number of European languages, in which the official delegates of the League of Nations were told what was the matter with the world



and how it might be cured. I have a copy of that historic document here tonight in the English language, and it seems to me it is as true tonight and as prophetic as it was seven years ago when our committee, consisting of Arthur Madsen, our International linguist, accompanied by F. C. R. Douglas, great economist of our movement on the other side of the sea, presented their argument informally and unofficially to the statesmen of fifty nations who had been called to find a way to end the economic war that was then and is still going on.

The statesmen were reminded that the world of today constitutes a single economic organization, for there is no longer any nation which can call itself self-sufficient. Division of labor has long ago transcended national boundaries, and the argument for the necessity of free intercourse and trade between nations, has now acquired an overwhelming significance because the interdependence of peoples is greater now than ever before.

We told the statesmen at Geneva that the international division of labor is the economic basis of civilized life, and that the duty of Governments now is to reconcile the legitimate claims of nationalism with that economic internationalism which has grown up in spite of statesmen, everywhere.

We pointed out that the impoverishment of people in Europe and elsewhere, the growth of unemployment, reduction of wages, and the gross inequalities in distribution of wealth due to land monopoly and oppressive taxation were giving rise to problems of more than national importance. These things were creating a state of mind among the masses of every country which, on the one hand threatened stability of governments, and on the other hand encouraged the idea of economic improvement by means of territorial expansion at the expense of backward and distant people.

We pointed to the antagonism and friction caused by interference through tariffs and through other means, with the normal exchange of the products of labor between friendly peoples. We pointed to the fact that the struggle for new markets and the sources of raw materials stimulated the demand for colonial expansion, for trade concessions and for protectorates.

When one reads this document of the Georgeists International union today, one sees how prophetic it was when it pointed out that it was a truism of historical study that the struggle for raw materials and new markets expressing itself in colonial expansion and the forcible annexation of territories, the establishment of treaty ports, and resorts to war for extension of colonial possessions, has been one of the chief causes of international jealousies and discord.

We have only to point across the sea to Geneva tonight where the dire issue of war or peace hangs as if by a slender thread, to realize how clear was the vision of the followers of Henry George whose plea to that Economic Conference was ignored when we asked for the breaking down of

tariff barriers, the existence of which were plainly inconsistent with a League pledged to the maintenance of world peace so long as public policies should continue to be based on the theory that the producers in one nation should aim to bring advantage to themselves at the expense of the producers of another nation.

We pointed out that there could be no permanent political peace in the world in the face of a continuance of economic war.

Well, it is now history that the first great Economic Conference of the League of Nations adjourned without action or agreement upon action. In a scornful editorial at that time, the *Manchester Guardian* declared that the Conference was but a waste of time and that it ended simply in oratory and futility.

I have never been convinced, however, that our arguments were without influence at that Conference, because I know first that our indefatigable linguist, Mr. Madsen, was so tireless in the distribution and accentuation of our argument that he seemed to have impressed the splendid President of the Conference, Mons. Theunis of Belgium, who, in a final review at the close of the Conference, used this language:

"The main trouble of the world today is neither any material shortage in the resources of nature, nor any inadequacies in man's power to exploit them. It is all, in one form or another, a maladjustment—not an insufficient productive capacity, but a series of impediments to the full utilization of that capacity. The main obstacles to economic revival have been the hindrances opposed to the free flow of labor, of capital, and of goods."

A better argument for what was then and what is now the matter with the world, or a better argument for Henry George's philosophy of freedom, as a cure for it all, could hardly be made by Mr. Madsen himself.

Well, there have been other Economic Conferences held since then, and many Conferences looking to the disarmament of nations, all of which have led to the same end,—speeches and futility.

But the Henry George International Union with its friends, and followers of Henry George in many lands, will still carry on, realizing that the great truth which our inspired leader, Henry George, sought to make plain, for the benefit of mankind everywhere, must, in the Providence of God, ultimately triumph if there is to come an era of enduring Peace and Prosperity for the peoples of the world.

**N**OW, is it not as much an impairment of the right of property to take a lamb as to take a sheep? To take five per cent or twenty per cent as to take a hundred per cent? We would leave the whole of the value produced by individual exertion to the individual. We would respect the rights of property not to any limited extent, but fully.—Henry George, San Francisco, Feb., 1890.



## The Keynote Convention Speech, 1940

By HON. B. A. PARTMAN

### A Story of Tax Relief for Land and of New Deal Prosperity

By HARRY GUNNISON BROWN

Author of "The Economic Basis of Tax Reform"

(Concluded)

IT is true that some of the business men and landowners and owners of natural resources did not like to have their production restricted. But these were easily mollified by the benefit payments given them for holding their land out of use. And nearly all of the truly practical men felt that the output of their competitors ought to be restricted, in order that prices might be kept high enough and that land values might be kept high. So it was not merely or even chiefly academic advisors who supported these measures but influential business men and landowners,—the really practical men of affairs. Indeed, many of the narrow-minded and theoretical academic economists were so wedded to their outmoded ideas of competition that they were unable to comprehend the advantages of the new policy.

Special measures were necessary to control the output of oil and to raise the royalties of owners of oil wells. In this industry, merely withdrawing a part of the land from use was not enough, because the oil flowed underground and, by drilling on some land, oil could be drained from beneath other land. Much was made of the importance of conserving the oil resource of the nation for future generations. A few critics of the restriction policy suggested that something could be done by removing the tariff on oil brought from foreign countries, so that our resources could be saved for posterity. But this, of course, would not have met the need, for it would have kept down the price of oil, whereas what was wanted was to have a high price of oil and high royalties to the owners of oil wells and high values for oil-bearing lands and, therefore, greater general prosperity. Various restrictive devices were adopted under the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act, to realize these ends. Of course, recovery was thereby greatly promoted.

To make especially certain that there would not be too large a production of coal or too many jobs mining coal or too low a scale of royalties for coal mine owners or too low a value of coal mines, Senator Y. introduced a bill providing for the appropriation of \$300,000,000 of Federal funds to buy up some of the poorer coal mines and withhold them from use.

Although Senator Y. appears not to have publicly announced these aims, it would surely be a gross insult

to his intelligence to suppose him unfamiliar with the President's principles of the manifest consistency of his own bill with these principles.

Unfortunately, some of the most important New Deal legislation was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Certain opposition conservatives were delighted at this, saying it meant the end of restriction and regimentation. But the outstanding liberal and progressive leaders of our great party of the common people rightly pointed out that the Supreme Court was standing in the very path of progress, that it was applying the outworn legal interpretations and principles of the horse and buggy era to an age of steam and electricity and gasoline, an age when it was superlatively important that a sufficient amount of land and sites and natural resources should be held out of use so as to decrease production and hold prices up and maintain and increase land values and give the common people more employment and make the nation more prosperous. The constitution should be changed, therefore, to permit the Federal government to do anything which might be necessary to accomplish these ends and, especially, to preserve and increase the high land values which are the only sure foundation of prosperity. The common people quickly came to realize the overwhelming importance of this and the constitution was accordingly modernized.

Of course almost everyone understood by this time that the more land that was withdrawn from use the less goods could be produced, and that the prices of goods were thereby increased and the competition to use land intensified and that land rents and land values were thus raised and all the people made more prosperous. But now there began to be noted a most amazing phenomenon which neither the brain trusters nor the practical politicians nor even the substantial business men were able, for a long time, to explain to the common people, although some of the literary intelligentsia said they had understood it all along. Since the people were more prosperous, they could have more to enjoy and more goods had to be produced for them. Thus, the more land was taken out of production and the more the output of goods was restricted thereby, the more goods were produced. The common people, so to speak, enjoyed and produced more because they produced less, as well as because they paid more of this less for less space on which to produce less and thus have more. Some sceptics said that all this could not possibly be true. But Prof. G., perhaps the most eminent of American mathematicians, worked out a series of equations by which the phenomenon could be beautifully and clearly explained, at least to all those who could understand the equations.

\* \* \*

As the people of the nation became more and more intellectually acute through contemplation and admiration of the New Deal policy and of its marvelous con-



sequences, it became possible to extend this policy in ways that before would have been impossible because the people would not have been intellectually capable of understanding their advantages and, therefore, would not have supported them. So now the President began planning a further application of the great principle of raising the value of land. After a series of conferences with officers of the National Real Estate Board and with leading landowners and with the eminent academic authorities on taxation and finance, Prof. L. and Prof. S., and with Dr. Z. and Senator X., the President made his new plan public and explained its significance.

But first he reminded the people of the country, and especially the common people, that the essence of his entire programme was the raising and maintaining of the price of land, that, as had often been stated, high land values are the foundation of prosperity, that land values had been made higher by reducing, in all of the States, the taxes on land, so that the owners of land could now keep for themselves nearly all of the community-produced rent of land instead of having a considerable fraction of it taxed into the public treasury, and that land values had been further raised by giving landowners, out of the processing taxes, large benefit payments for withdrawing land from use. In short, the rest of the people, under the new system, were paying each year larger sums than ever before to the owners of land for permission to live and to work in the United States, and especially in those parts of the country having great situation advantages due almost wholly to community growth and development. Obviously, if ways could be devised by which the rest of the people might be made to pay still more to the owners of land for permission to live and to work in the United States than they were now paying, this would make the land values of the nation higher than they already were and so would make the nation yet more prosperous.

So the President said he thought it would be a logical extension and improvement of his system, to increase the processing taxes and the taxes on sales, on motion pictures and on incomes earned as salaries and wages by the labor of the people and incomes from constructed capital accumulated by the people's thrift, and to give the extra revenue received to the owners of land as a bonus. The States should co-operate by removing all remaining taxes on land. His specific proposal was to give every landowner, out of taxes, one additional dollar for each dollar he was already receiving.

The only vocal objection to this proposal, which seems worth mentioning, came from some landowners who thought it would make the nation still more prosperous to give them, instead, two dollars for every dollar they were now getting and thus increase the value of their land by two hundred per cent instead of only one hundred. But the President felt it better not to risk

getting ahead of public opinion and, therefore, did not ask Congress to go so far.

An administration measure providing for the one hundred per cent landowners' bonus was quickly introduced into Congress. Some of the members of Congress, as it happened, did not at first support the President in his proposal but, when a bonus army of landowners was organized and began to march on Washington singing the Marseillaise, the opposition capitulated and the measure was enacted into law.

One of the splendid and, probably, unanticipated results of this latest New Deal enactment was pointed out, several months after the passage of the law giving a bonus to all landowners, by Mrs. W., a prominent clubwoman and a well known patroness of art. The President's policy was bringing about, she said, the greatest esthetic development the nation had ever had. Landowners were receiving such large rents that they could not spend their incomes in the ordinary ways to which they had become accustomed, so now they were purchasing paintings and statuary for themselves and, indeed, of themselves, and endowing art galleries in which even the poorest citizens could acquire taste and artistic discrimination; and the demand for works of art was stimulating an interest among young people in providing such works. Also, the palatial homes that the recipients of these large rents were building were often models of architectural beauty and were thus ideals to be aimed at by the common people when they bought land and built for themselves. So the President's New Deal policy had not only tremendously enhanced the material prosperity of the nation but had furthered the development, as well, of the things of the spirit.

Although Mrs. W. confined her comment to art, it is perhaps worth mentioning that universities and colleges were also endowed by the now superlatively prosperous landowners, in which the young people whose privilege it was to attend them studied not alone art and architecture and literature, but history and sociology and economics as well. In their classes in economics they learned to understand the President's economic policy and how it made the nation prosperous. Many of the poorer people of the nation, even yet, were not intellectually keen enough to see how the New Deal policy made them more prosperous, but the graduates of the universities and colleges endowed by the wealthy landowners and by the big stockholders of the giant corporations that owned the mines and power sites of the country, were usually able to see this.

It is true that once in a while the trustees of a college would discover a professor of economics whose teaching seemed to lead students away from the truth and to cloud their understanding. This, when it happened, was most regrettable. Of course all of the colleges maintained the great principle of academic freedom. No professor



was dismissed merely for holding unpopular opinions. Indeed, on a number of occasions, university presidents of great distinction went out of their way to defend professors who were being assailed for their opinions. For example, there was the case when President B. of Landonia University received a letter from an Alabama cotton cropper criticizing the attitude of a professor on the land question as being unfriendly to tenant farmers. President B. issued an immediate denunciation of the protesting farmer as being a menace to the principle of freedom of thought and teaching in academic walls. President B's. courageous remonstrance against this minous threat to freedom of research has since become one of the glorious memories of the American academic tradition.

But a professor might quite properly be dismissed for incompetence, and it was obvious to President B., as to the trustees who employed him, that a professor of economics who could not see and appreciate the truly impressive economic advantages of the New Deal policy of raising land values, was incompetent and no fit teacher of youth. So most of such professors were allowed to find other jobs.

Since, in spite of the high and increasing rents and values and the great prosperity of the more substantial citizens, there seemed still to be some poverty among the working classes, a number of the more sympathetic among the wealthy felt that research was needed to discover the causes for this poverty in the midst of such superlatively favorable conditions. So research foundations were endowed and professors of economics, sociology, of statistics, of psychology, of biology and of history were drawn from the universities to direct the researches and to discover the individual and family and sociological and psychological and biological causes of poverty.

One or two voices were raised to say that it was easy enough for any one with horse sense and an open mind to discover the principal cause of poverty, that a horse—or even a jackass—never offers the horse flies that live from his blood an additional drop of blood for every drop they can extract without help but, on the contrary, switches at them with his tail as effectively, not to say viciously, as he knows how. But the critics who so spoke had obviously had no training in the technique of research.

The new endowments provided interesting work for many sociologists, economists and statisticians, and the researches led to the conclusion that there ought to be more attention paid to social work, including individual and family case work; and that higher sales taxes should be levied to pay for such service. So higher sales taxes were levied for this and also to raise money to train more students in economics, statistics, sociology, etc., so that the nation might have a still larger number of intelligent

and technically trained leaders in seeking the causes of poverty and the path of prosperity.

\* \* \*

When all the people—except a few of very low intelligence quotients—came to realize fully how greatly their prosperity had been increased by reducing and, finally, abolishing, taxes on land and sites and allowing all of the rents and royalties from sites and natural resources to be enjoyed by private owners for giving others permission to live on the land and make use of these resources; and when they realized how the property values of the nation had been still further increased by the processing taxes and by using the money to make special rental payments to landowners for holding more land out of use than they were already holding; and when they saw how giving a bonus to all landowners on all of their land, to the extent of one hundred per cent of the rent they were receiving, had raised land values to even greater heights; efforts were made to work out further extensions of the plan, which would enrich the nation even more.

At first, no one, not even the smartest brain truster, could think of anything which promised any further accession of prosperity. At length, however, a scheme was worked out in conference by the President, Senator X. and Dr. Z., which seemed likely to bring to final fruition the series of reformist and prosperity-building measures that the President and his cabinet and administration leaders had sponsored. The idea was, to extend the principle of private and corporate collection of land rent from those permitted to work and to live on the earth and to enjoy community-produced situation advantages, and make it apply likewise to the use of the oceans and of inland lakes and rivers. Because of the difficulty of getting an international agreement on the matter, no charge could be made for the use of the oceans beyond the three-mile limit, but arrangements were made that far.

To begin with, of course, it was necessary to get sections of the oceans, lakes and rivers reduced to private and corporate ownership. The method selected for doing this had the further advantage of saving the government expense. Those who were being paid by the government for holding land out of use or who were receiving bonuses, were given the option of being paid their benefits or their bonuses wholly in money or partly in tapering ribbon-like sections of ocean (or lake or river) leading to a port. If they accepted the latter alternative—and many did—they could thereafter, besides collecting from industry and commerce for granting permission to use the earth, also collect from commerce for granting permission to use these ribbons of ocean.

Special electrical devices were invented whereby it became possible to know what routes vessels followed to port after coming within the three-mile limit, and each ribbon owner was allowed to make his own charge to ships coming into or leaving port over his ribbon of ocean.



This wise enactment enhanced still more the property values of the nation. For now there was added to the value of the land, due to the fact that owners could charge users for permission to live or to work on it or otherwise enjoy its advantages, the value of the ribbons of ocean resulting from the fact that private owners could henceforth charge others for permission to sail over or ship or receive goods over their ribbons.

An incidental advantage of the new scheme was that it hastened the disappearance of that lingering anachronism, the sailing vessel. Whenever the wind was unfavorable, sailing vessels were compelled to tack and thus had to sail over so many ribbons and pay rent to so many ribbon owners, that these vessels were utterly unable to operate at a profit. So the new plan furthered technological progress.

There was one temporary difficulty which, however, was soon overcome. In the case of some of the harbors, the ribbon routes by which ships could enter and leave were so numerous, and competition among the ribbon owners was so keen, that only very small rentals could be charged, and so the ribbons had only small value and could not add to the prosperity of the nation as much as they should have done. But as soon as this was noted, the President conferred with Dr. Z. on the matter, after which he had introduced into Congress an administration measure which provided that, in all such cases, enough of the ribbon strips should be withdrawn from possible use, with compensatory payment to their owners from special tariff duties and new processing taxes, so that the rents and sale prices of the ribbon strips would be raised to a reasonable figure. Then, as the brain trusters and the landowners had foreseen, there was a further increase of business activity and employment. For, as administration leaders hereafter stated the great New Deal formula and principle: high land values and high ribbon strip values are the foundation of prosperity.

\* \* \*

One other and final measure, rounding out and bringing to a fitting climax the truly great policies of the administration in providing a New Deal for the common people, certainly deserves to be explained. This was the provision by which all non-landowners should, upon meeting landowners or, at any rate, upon meeting the larger landowners, for the transaction of any kind of business or upon social occasions, remove their hats and bow very low three times. Of course they were to bow similarly to the owners of the ocean ribbons.

When this law was first proposed, there was some criticism expressed of it on the ground that it served no good purpose and that it was un-American and an aping of the aristocratic forms of monarchist nations. But both of these criticisms were unjustified, as the President pointed out in one of his intimate radio talks to the people. In the first place, he explained, the provision for respectful triple obeisance would serve a most useful and im-

portant purpose, indeed, the very same purpose as all his other measures, in that its enactment would make land more valuable and thereby vastly increase the prosperity of our great country. When landowners were treated with the respect due to their ownership, more people would want to be landowners than had previously wanted to, so many of them would go without other things and try to spend their savings in buying land. But there was no more land than before, and the fact that landowners who continued to be landowners could have all other persons bow three times before them on every social and business occasion, would make them unwilling to sell and to thus cease to be landowners, except at such prices for land as had never before been dreamed of. Thus, land must rise greatly in price or value and the nation must become even more prosperous than it had already become.

To the charge that the suggested new law was un-American, the President had an answer equally conclusive. The system he had proposed differed from the systems of old-world countries, he said, because those to whom honor was paid were not born irrevocably to this honor nor did they have it thrust upon them, but they must acquire it, or, at any rate, hold on to it; and in America, the land of equal opportunity for all, any one could qualify for the honor of being thus triply bowed to, merely by saving enough to buy a sizable piece of land. America could still be the country of the self-made man as much as it had ever been, and now land values would overtop all previous records. Besides, if it was good for the poorer people to have to pay landowners rent for community-produced advantages, and for permission to live and to work in the United States, and to pay taxes to construct roads and streets and public buildings, and to pay processing taxes to reward landowners for withdrawing land from use, and to pay taxes to provide money to give bonuses to landowners, all because the value of land was raised thereby, then certainly it must be good for them to do just a little harmless bowing and scraping if this would also raise the value of land, as of course it would. The President's logic was so forceful and convincing that Congress passed the desired legislation without debate and, indeed, with whoops of enthusiasm.

There was a little difficulty at first because so much of the land and natural resources of the country was owned by corporations, such as coal mining companies and steel companies and power plants and big retail establishments and real estate companies. The common people did not know whether to bow to the corporation buildings or to the officers. But this difficulty was most happily resolved by the Supreme Court which decided that ownership, like guilt, was personal and that if any individual owned enough of the stock or the bonds of a corporation which owned a great deal of land, then he was entitled to receive the prescribed triple obeisance.



Such large owners of corporation securities might wear a special kind of mark on their clothing to distinguish them. If they neglected to wear this mark then they must not complain in case they failed to receive the proper obeisance. But, fortunately, there were quite a few cases where upstart chain-store and other corporations were doing business on land owned by and leased from old residents of their cities, scions of the finest and oldest families, and then all the employees of these corporations had to show proper respect whenever they sold goods to these old residents or paid rent to them or met them on social occasions.

It should be noted, in passing, that the obeisance law corrected an evil result of the previous tax relief and New Deal legislation which even the wisest statesmen and scholars and brain trusters had not anticipated. The common people, such as the cotton croppers and other farm tenants and city laborers, were becoming so fat and sleek from overfeeding, because they were now so prosperous, due to land values being so high, due to the high rents and taxes and bonuses they were paying for permission to work and live on the earth, that some of them were hardly able to sit down. But now the many and rapid obeisances that were constantly required of them, caused them to sweat profusely and lose weight rapidly, without having to consume dangerous proprietary anti-fat preparations, and so they regained their previous sylph-like forms and, indeed, even better forms. Thus the New Deal policy not only raised land values and increased prosperity and promoted art and architecture and the intellectual life and things of the spirit generally, but it gave the people more attractive and youthful-looking waistlines than they had ever had before.

There were a few conservative people who somehow failed to understand the full logic of the President's policy in this matter and who demanded that similar obeisance should be offered to persons not owning any land, provided they owned a sufficient amount of other property, e.g., valuable machinery, buildings or merchandise on land owned by and leased from others. Like the socialists, and the parlor pinks of the *New Republic* and other high-brow magazine variety, these conservatives stressed no distinction between community-produced land value on the one hand and constructed capital on the other hand. But administration leaders seemed clearly to understand this distinction, for they pointed out to the people that by giving special honors to the owners of capital the government could not, in any appreciable degree, raise the value of capital, since, even if people wanted more of it and were willing to buy more this increased desire could easily be met by increasing the amount of capital constructed. But the amount of space and natural resources, as distinct from buildings and improvements and other capital, could not be thus increased; and so, when more people wanted land

and wanted it more desperately, the value of land rose and the nation became accordingly more prosperous.

By the time the new law had been in effect a very few months, the people became at last thoroughly familiar with the President's New Deal principles, saw clearly the philosophy of the law, and bowed and scraped on every proper occasion, to the great gratification of landowners, and with a great increase in the desire to be landowners and in competition to buy land, and with a correspondingly great rise in the value of land and in the prosperity of the nation, and with a final and thorough discrediting of all those impractical theorists, such as Single Taxers, who would use the annual community-produced situation rent of land as a principal source of public revenue and who would untax, so far as possible, the earnings of labor, all buildings and improvements produced by labor, and the necessities of the poor.

It is, indeed, an inspiration to all understanding minds and hearts, on any morning or afternoon or evening, to see such assiduous bending and straightening on the part of so many people, in the stores, in the hotels, at teas and receptions and on all the highways and byways of the nation, and to realize that the impressive and courtly ceremonies of the past have not vanished forever from the earth, but are doing their significant part to increase the value of the land and, with it, the prosperity of our great country.

\* \* \*

And now, as this wonderful and extraordinary eight-year period draws to a close, we ask for the whole-hearted support of all the friends of labor and of the common people, regardless of previous political affiliations. This support we ask for in order that no backward step may be taken, in order that the sacred rights of property of those who have purchased land relying on a continuance of established policy may not suffer infringement, and in order that the splendid and prosperity-building American system of paying rent and still more rent, and of paying bonuses besides, to individuals and to private corporations for permitting us to use natural resources and community-produced advantages, and the great American ideal of keeping land values high, may never fade from the minds of patriotic American citizens but may go on to gladden the hearts of forgotten men yet unborn.

“SUPPOSING the entire habitable globe to be enclosed, it follows that if the landowners have a valid right to its surface, all who are not landowners have no right at all to its surface. Hence such can exist on the earth by sufferance only. They are all trespassers. Save by the permission of the lords of the soil, they can have no room for the soles of their feet. Nay, should the others think fit to deny them resting place, these landless men might equitably be expelled from the earth altogether.”—HERBERT SPENCER, *Social Statics*.



## Across the Country With the Henry George School of Social Science---All Aboard!

CINCINNATI, O.—Three classes. Enrollment of 68. Advertising of classes consisted in mailing out 250 announcements, placing posters in all public libraries and many drug stores, and broadcasting one or two minute "flashes" over a local radio station. Class instructors include a minister and two lawyers.

CLEVELAND, O.—Three classes, also enrollment of 85. Meet in John Marshall School of Law and a downtown public school building. Here we see a strong student alumni council. "The general enthusiasm of these students of the prior classes is most stimulating and is a splendid testimonial of the effectiveness of the Cleveland Extension," writes Francis J. Fee, Secretary of Philadelphia's Student Alumni Council who recently visited Cleveland. The Cleveland Council publishes a monthly bulletin, *The Answer*.

PITTSBURGH, PA.—Demands are so great on Prof. Richard E. (Dick) Howe that he's expecting to devote all his time to organizing and teaching classes within a 50-mile radius of the Smoky City of Mayor William N. McNair, S. T. Pittsburgh has its own school quarters in the downtown Keystone building. It has an advanced class in "Protection or Free Trade" under Chief Assessor Percy R. Williams. Other teachers: City Assessor Hugo Noren and City Architect Robert C. Bowers.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.—A high school teacher, Julian P. Hickok, is Extension Secretary for Philadelphia and was one of the first to organize and conduct an extension class. Had one or two classes last year. One started Oct. 8 with an enrollment of 30. Another started Nov. 7. The Student Alumni Council, of which Mr. Fee is secretary, is active.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The first classes in the Nation's Capitol are to start shortly after the first of the year. The instructor will be Mrs. Elizabeth M. Phillips, inventor of the famous Landlord's Game. Among the sponsors are Mrs. Louis F. Post and Rev. John C. Palmer.

NEW YORK CITY.—Classes at National Headquarters are booming. There are thirteen classes with an enrollment of 300. This is the response to 6,000 announcements. Fifteen thousand will be in the mails for the winter classes opening the week of Jan. 6. A teacher's training class has proven very useful and popular. Membership is limited to graduates of the course which uses "Progress and Poverty" as the textbook. A journalism class is now being conducted to train graduates in writing Georgeist articles for newspapers and magazines.

BOSTON, MASS.—Classes started Nov. 15. Meet in an art gallery. "About sixty-five people turned up at

the first meeting of the class on Friday! We were prepared for over fifty, but a few had to sit on the tables," writes Mrs. Francis G. Goodale, Extension Secretary. "We shall certainly have to divide the class into two groups,—probably three."

CHICOPEE FALLS, MASS.—Writes Instructor John B. Knight: "I started my class on Oct. 23 with an enrollment of eight young men, all between the ages of 21 and 26. The boys are certainly showing a surprising amount of interest and from their questions and answers they are evidently working hard on the lessons. The discussions are most interesting and I am certainly getting a great kick out of the class."

DETROIT, MICH.—One fine class of 40 students with a good professor, Attorney Henry C. L. Forler. Meets in the Public Library.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—Attorney Louis B. Schwartz had two or three successful classes last spring and is starting out with a large one this fall. Expects 300 graduates this school year. Frank Chodorov carried the idea to Minneapolis and Mr. Schwartz did the rest.

SPRINGFIELD, MO.—Until this fall Dr. J. V. Boswell was the only Henry George man in Springfield, Mo. He will not be alone however when his class is completed. It began on Friday evening, Oct. 11, meeting in the Senior High School. Enrollment upwards of 30. The daily papers have given the class extensive publicity. "Henry George is really the teacher," Doctor Boswell told a local reporter. "I merely conduct the class."

KANSAS CITY, MO.—Edward White, Extension Secretary and instructor for Kansas City, circularized members of labor unions and secured a good enrollment for his first class.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.—First class opened Nov. 1. Enrollment, 36. "How many of these will stick is of course a question of how interesting we can make the studies," writes Mr. E. M. Stagland, Extension Secretary. This is written in the spirit that will make the class successful!

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.—There are five classes in the greater Los Angeles district: one each in Pasadena, Glendale, Long Beach, Santa Ana, and Los Angeles proper. This growth is a tribute to the several instructors and to Mr. C. W. Silvernale, Extension Secretary for Southern California.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.—The city that gave us "Progress and Poverty" will not be without a class, thanks to Noah Alper, who writes, "I will surely have a variety of types of students and some very brilliant people."

On this trip we've had to make only limited stops. We've not had a chance to visit Selma, Alabama, Canton and Peoria, Ill., Columbus and Youngstown, O., Fall River, Mass., and some thirty other centers where classes are now being conducted. Take another trip with us in the next issue of LAND AND FREEDOM!



## Extension Classes of the Henry George School

### ALABAMA

SELMA. *Instructor:* William H. Dinkins, A. M., President, Selma University.

### CALIFORNIA

GLENDALE. *Instructor:* Hollis C. Joy, 1850 Verdugo Knolls Drive.

LONG BEACH. *Instructor:* F. Darwin Smith, President, California College of Commerce.

LOS ANGELES. *Extension Secretary for Southern California:* C. W. Silvernale, 7356 Willoughby Avenue. *Instructor:* Harry Farrell, 8721 Olympic Avenue.

PASADENA. *Instructor:* George E. Lee, 1900 Paloma Street.

SAN DIEGO. *Extension Secretary:* E. M. Stangland, 2660 National Avenue.

SAN FRANCISCO. *Extension Secretary:* N. D. Alper, 83 McAllister Street.

SANTA ANA. *Instructor:* Ben E. Tarver, Suite 418, Otis Building.

### CONNECTICUT

HARTFORD. *Instructor:* Mrs. Nathan Hillman, 19 West Raymond Street.

NORFOLK. *Instructor:* Joseph R. Carroll.

STRATFORD. *Extension Secretary:* William J. Lee, 219 Burritt Avenue.

WATERBURY. *Extension Secretary:* Dr. Royal E. S. Hayes, 314 W. Main Street.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON. *Extension Secretary:* Mrs. Elizabeth M. Phillips, 2309 N. Custis Road, Clarendon, Va.

### ILLINOIS

CANTON. *Instructor:* Mabell Brooks, Moran Apts.

CHICAGO. *Extension Secretary:* Maurice Welty, 4833 Dakin Street.

OAK PARK. *Extension Secretary:* J. Edward Jones, 137 N. Marion Street.

PEORIA. *Extension Secretary:* Albert Henniges, 326 Harrison Street.

### MASSACHUSETTS

ANNISQUAM. *Instructor:* James B. Ellery.

BOSTON. *Extension Secretary:* Mrs. Francis G. Goodale, 79 Webster Road, Weston, Mass.

CHICOPEE FALLS. *Instructor:* John B. Knight, 91 Main Street.

FALL RIVER. *Instructor:* Rev. William R. Reid, 373 N. Main Street.

SANDWICH. *Instructor:* Lincoln Crowell.

SOUTH EGREMONT. *Extension Secretary:* John M. Miller,

### MICHIGAN

CEDAR SPRINGS. *Instructor:* J. S. Tindall.

DETROIT. *Extension Secretary:* William J. Palmer, 1257 National Bank Building.

GRAND RAPIDS. *Extension Secretary:* M. Herman Friedrich, 701 Livingston, N.E.

### MINNESOTA

MINNEAPOLIS. *Instructor:* Louis B. Schwartz, 310 McKnight Building.

### MISSOURI

KANSAS CITY. *Extension Secretary:* Edward White, 300 La Salle Building.

SPRINGFIELD. *Extension Secretary:* Dr. J. V. Boswell, 823 Woodruff Building.

### NEW HAMPSHIRE

EAST ALSTEAD. *Instructor:* Hartley Dennett.

### NEW JERSEY

NEWARK. *Instructor:* Dr. Elizabeth E. Bowen, Jacksonville Road, Towaco, N. J.

WESTFIELD. *Instructor:* Edwin J. Jones, 311 Prospect Street.

### NEW YORK

BROOKLYN. *Instructor:* John Luxton, 496 E. 46th Street. *Instructor:* David Chodorov, Executive's Secretarial Training School, 1560 Flatbush Avenue.

BRONX. *Instructor:* Max Berkowitz, 655 E. 223rd Street.

FLORAL PARK, L. I. *Instructor:* Leonard T. Recker, 230 W. 17th Street, New York City.

MIDDLETOWN. *Extension Secretary:* Miss Candace B. Fuller, 128 Academy Road.

NEW YORK CITY. *National Headquarters:* O. K. Dorn, Business Manager, 211 West 79th Street.

SCHENECTADY. *Extension Secretary:* W. W. Munro, R. D. No. 3.

### OHIO

CINCINNATI. *Extension Secretary:* E. E. Hardcastle, Union Central Life Insurance Co.

CLEVELAND. *Extension Secretary:* Virgil D. Allen, 2304 Bellfield Road, Cleveland Heights.

COLUMBUS. *Extension Secretary:* J. H. Kauffman, 403 State House Annex.

YOUNGSTOWN. *Extension Secretary:* Charles C. McGowan, 25 S. Hazel Street.

### PENNSYLVANIA

BEAVER. *Instructor:* Richard E. Howe, 810 Keystone Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

PHILADELPHIA. *Extension Secretary:* Julian P. Hickok, 315 Zeralda Street.

PITTSBURGH. *Extension Secretary:* Richard E. Howe, 810 Keystone Building.

SOMERSET. *Instructor:* Ernest O. Kooser.



## TEXAS

HOUSTON. *Instructor:* Mrs. Bessie Beach Truehart, 5308 Alameda Road.

## WASHINGTON

ALDERWOOD MANOR. *Instructor:* W. H. Proctor.

TACOMA. *Instructor:* Robert S. Doubleday, 2306 S. Yakima Avenue.

## CANADA

MILK RIVER, ALBERTA. *Instructor:* J. B. Ellert.

TORONTO, ONTARIO. *Instructors:* Alan C. Thompson, 100 Lombard Street. Miss Dorothy E. Coate, Rosseau, Ontario.

## MEXICO

MONTEREY. *Instructor:* E. S. Westrup, Ave Morales 132, Ote.

## Activities of The Manhattan Single Tax Club

THOUGH the club is active in correspondence, sending out literature, and its president is addressing such service clubs, church and civic organizations as he can get opportunities to, the principal activity, at present, is the president's radio addresses; in fact, Mr. Ingersoll's acknowledged interest in the past year or two has been mainly in stabilizing and standardizing his messages to the general public, delivered through the microphone.

Mr. Ingersoll believes that through this channel, the Georgeist movement has an open door to widespread propaganda—at least as extensive as Father Coughlin's; and he is bending every effort to the perfection of technique: first, in making statements that are free from obscurities, and that effectively connect our simple philosophy with the uneducated mind. Second, associating the message with familiar events; and without dragging Single Tax in by the ears. Third, technique of delivery and relationship with stations.

Mr. Ingersoll is determined to have a medium for reproducing his broadcasts, especially for the few friends now supporting his work.

The current schedule is given here; it averages about twenty broadcasts weekly, requiring six originals, the preparation of which requires a minimum of five hours each.

### CHARLES H. INGERSOLL'S BROADCASTING SCHEDULE

Monday. WVFW—9:30 a.m.; WCNW—2:30 p.m.; WHOM—7:30 p.m.

Tuesday. WLTH—1:15 p.m.; WCNW—2:30 p.m.; WHOM—7:30 p.m.

Wednesday. WWRL—1:15 p.m.; WCNW—2:30 p.m.; WHOM—7:30 p.m.

Thursday. WBBC—12:45 p.m.; WCNW—2:30 p.m.; WHOM—7:30 p.m.

Friday. WILM (Wilmington)—3:15 p.m.; WDAS (Phila.)—5:30 p.m.

Saturday. WDAS (Phila.)—10:45 a.m.; WWRL—10:45 p.m.

HARRIET SAWYER, Secretary.

## Report of Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

FOLLOWING the printing of the letter of Lord Snowden in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, it was decided to reproduce the message in full, in circular form, so that it could be broadcast to the best of our ability among people whose interest in free trade and the land question might be awakened. A total of 11,000 people were circularized, this list including our Single Tax friends of the movement who have been interested in the books of Henry George, high school teachers, librarians, editors and many of the new students who have gone through classes in "Progress and Poverty." As a result, we have received hundreds of interesting letters and a demand for "Protection or Free Trade" as well as other writings of Henry George.

At the request of the Alumni Council group in Cleveland, Mr. Byron C. Taylor, Secretary, we circularized a list of ministers in Cleveland, writing a special letter calling attention to the pamphlet "Moses." Copy of this pamphlet was sent with each letter and some fine replies were received. The Alumni Council supplied one half of the expense of this work, the Foundation meeting the other half. This is one good way of doing constructive work under the guidance of alumni groups. A plan is evolved, the local situation is developed, and the Foundation then helps to the extent that it can in the furtherance of the project. It is on this basis that we have continued to supply the libraries of Georgia in conjunction with the generous gifts that Mr. H. C. Harris has made, in placing Henry George books in every library in the State of Georgia.

Likewise, recently a list of Rabbis in Bronx County were supplied with the pamphlet "Moses" at the suggestion of Mr. Edward Polak. Mr. Walter Mendelson of Germantown suggested gifts of books to certain libraries in Shadyside and Neffs, Ohio, which are for the aid and information of the coal miners—a project which is sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee for coal areas.

The opportunities to individual Single Taxers as well as to alumni groups who, graduating from one of the Extension Classes, are looking for constructive things to do, are numerous. Libraries, both educational and public, need more copies of Henry George's books. An alumni group can combine, or an individual can offer to give a certain amount towards the placing of books in these libraries. Groups in the community can be circularized with appropriate pamphlets and literature.

Graduates of classes can train themselves to speak before civic organizations, and, since we often have requests for speakers, we will be glad to hear from those who will volunteer to speak in their respective communities.

Recently, Mr. Elwood Lewis of Northport, N. Y. asked us for a speaker for the Rotary Club of Northport, and



Mr. Heman Chase was kind enough to accede to our request that he go to the meeting, and address the club on the subject of Single Tax.

One of the large Foundations asked us the other day for special information to be sent to Washington to one of the departments where an investigation was to be made of Single Tax Colonies, with a view to adopting, if practicable, the theory and operation of the existing colonies in an effort to spread the general work of resettlement and homesteading.

Among the colleges and schools that have responded to recent material which we have sent out are the following:

Girls High School, City of Boston; Mount Vernon Junior College, Mount Vernon, Washington; New Jersey College for Women, Political Science Department, New Brunswick, New Jersey; University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri; University of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York; Iowa Pupils Reading Circle, Des Moines, Iowa; College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Arkansas; Catawba College, Salsbury, North Carolina; Wayland College, Plainview, Texas.

From Clayton C. Kohl, State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, where, by the way, Mr. Monroe made interesting contacts in the earlier part of the year, we received the following letter:

"I am giving a course in 'Progress and Poverty' this semester at the University here and I want all of my students, twelve in number, to read the book, which I feel is one of the really great books of history in its field. My students come in from twenty to thirty miles on Saturdays only. Kindly send twelve copies."

We sent Professor Kohl the twelve books ordered, a Teacher's Manual and a sheaf of all of the pamphlets we publish, that might be of interest to a teacher who is grooming his pupils for possible debate, etc.

One of the busiest phases of our work this fall has been the supplying of books and information to the Extension Classes which have started in various cities. Elsewhere, Mr. Monroe lists the teachers who are conducting classes this season, and it will suffice to say that considerable correspondence has been held with each of these teachers at the time of organization of the classes. A total of 800 books shipped from September 1, comprised forty-seven separate orders each involving, correspondence and arrangements for prompt and careful shipping.

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN, Secretary.

**W**HATEVER improves the condition of the lowest and broadest social stratum must promote the true interests of all. Where the wages of common labor are high and remunerative employment is easy to obtain, prosperity will be general. Where wages are highest, there will be the largest production and the most distribution of wealth. There will invention be most active and the brain best guide the hand.—"PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE."

GET your friends to subscribe to LAND AND FREEDOM.

## The Beginning of the Henry George Fellowship

**A** SHORT paragraph that I found on page 165 of the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM sent me to look for a few precious written pages which were enclosed a year and a half ago, in an envelope marked "The Henry George Fellowship—early beginnings." This envelope lies beside me now, that a few words may, later, be quoted from its contents, so that there shall be no misunderstanding about so significant an event as the launching of the Henry George Fellowship.

First, however, it should be explained that in Oct. 1933, driven by the great poverty and human need that I found in my work in a large public school, I set out to seek the true explanation of the fact that men with tools, who knew their trade, who had families for whom they were eager and willing to work, *could find no work*.

I therefore entered the Henry George School of Social Science as a student seeking to find an answer to the problem that confronted me, and was told simply and gravely by the Director, Oscar H. Geiger, that I should come to know it, in these words—"You will know."

Thus encouraged, I continued to attend the course and found that he was right. There was a solution, and he knew it. And it was because he knew it, and knew also how men and women needed to know it, that Oscar Geiger was devoting his life to teaching seventy students in his day-time, evenings, and correspondence classes. To this end he had invested all that he had. To this end he gladly devoted his great teaching gifts, shared his wide knowledge and exact information. Never can we who personally knew him be grateful enough for the 'quality' of life we saw in him, consecrated as it was to the great ideal of causing men to recognize that there is a Natural Law in the Economic World which *must* be obeyed, if men are ever to become truly free and equal. To him there was no other way.

We his students came to recognize this too, and at last, to have rise within us the question—"What are we going to do about it?"—just as he had been affected years before (we learned) when as a young man, he finished reading in a single night the copy of "Progress and Poverty" which Dr. James Ferrier had lent him. We saw that his own answer to the question must have been "Teach the truth!"—and that he was living up to this conviction. It was to find a part of my answer to this same question that I went to his home one evening, where I learned more fully of the School's needs and of his faith in his work as part of the Intent in Nature, due to be brought to fruition as truly as seed sown in the earth will grow, if sown according to nature's laws.

To the idea that there must be forming amongst the students of the various groups a desire to be of service to him in his work he listened with deep attention.



The suggestion that the very experience of learning such vital truths through his guidance should be arousing already a feeling of comradeship amongst his students—even though some were entirely unknown to the others—he accepted as in line with his own hope and thought.

The belief expressed that it would be inspiring to all to personally know, for instance, the two students who had brought so large a number of others to the classes, found him warmly interested.

Then he quietly and with deep feeling uttered these momentous words, "It has always been a dream of mine that there might be a Henry George Fellowship."

This caused the whole thing to crystallize, as it were, into the next question, "May I visit the classes next week to bring these things before them?" The answer was "yes."

And so on the days and evenings of the following week, beginning with April 9, 1934 this message was given to the classes:

"Fellow students of the Henry George School:—Greeting!

"Has it yet occurred to any of you that it would be a pleasant and worthwhile thing for the groups of students in this school, studying vital truths in a unique period of the world's history, to meet together for purposes of fellowship and cooperation for the good of the cause and the good of the school? . . . . .

"One of the chief objects of this meeting is the hope that we may through it feel ourselves in sympathy with a deep desire of our leader, Mr. Geiger, that there be formed a Fellowship, to be known as "The Henry George Fellowship." . . . . .

The students met on April 19, and listened to the following opening words I felt moved to make to them.

"This is possibly a historic date for the Henry George movement for we have come together as students and friends of this school to unite in an even closer bond of union to be known as the Henry George Fellowship. . . . Intuition perhaps, friendship perhaps, God I feel sure, led me to seek the realities under the effort I observed being made in this school . . . . without thought of personal reward, a true "seeking first the Kingdom of Heaven, a true trusting of the promise that all things needful would be added." . . . . .

Then was read a paper we now know as "The Message," and the students were asked to send in their written opinions of the school and its work, to add to it, in order that it might be sent out as a student-message to all the friends of the Henry George movement throughout the nation, announcing the formation of the Henry George Fellowship, and inviting their cooperation in sending students and supplying scholarships.

That evening the students voted to establish the Fellowship. The following week in flowed their written opinions, and the printed message went out May 28, 1934.

Thus we have seen the Henry George Fellowship in its earliest beginnings, arising as an idea in the mind and soul of Oscar Geiger, and coming into being through the interest and effort of the student-group whom he had led into "paths where they no longer grope."

The Henry George Fellowship is his living memorial and its watch-word is—"Let Us Move Forward Together."

As it is developing, the Henry George Fellowship is not an organized body; it is the growing body of alumni of the Henry George School of Social Science wherever classes are formed, a free society, freely entered into for the advancement of a common ideal.

By the new year there should be over one thousand members, and it is proposed to proceed along these lines until the roster is one hundred thousand strong!

HELEN D. DENBIGH.

## Arthur Madsen at International Night Henry George Congress

MR. A. W. MADSEN related the difficulties that his colleague Mr. F. C. R. Douglas (the author of the "Memorandum"), and he met with at Geneva in endeavoring to get the views of the International Union officially accepted by some Government or other, but without success. Yet the document was placed in the hands of every one of the delegates and it had since been translated and circulated in fourteen languages, so that it had far wider notice and certainly very many more readers than anything the Conference itself produced. Since Geneva, with its futile resolution that tariffs had been raised high enough and should not be increased, more and more trade barriers had been erected. Added to the fiscal weapon of customs tariffs they now had the actual physical stoppage of goods by quotas, exchange restrictions and prohibitions. It was the mentality of war and was bringing the world to another Armageddon. As long as tariffs produced revenues, free trade would have the bitter opposition of the financial interests and the occupiers of the "house of have," who consider themselves secure under systems of indirect taxation. Free Traders fought a losing battle who did not see this connection and imagined that protectionist manufacturers were the only interests concerned, whereas the tariff issue was the "blanket code" for loading the burden of taxation upon the shoulders of the working people as a whole. The Governments of the United States Canada and Australia, not to speak of other countries, had contributed savagely to this process of taxing their own citizens to enrich privilege within their own boundaries. But the trade interferences led to reprisals taking the form, such is the madness of it all, of taxes and tribute imposed by other Governments on their own nationals. In Great Britain before the 1931 panic, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, then Labor Prime Minister, had supported the urgent demand for another World Conference to seek the return to sanity. The pretences and insincerities of that time were shown in the result. The new Government in 1931 deliberately surrendered British Free Trade. The protectionists led by Mr. Neville Chamberlain had to get their way. The tariff was imposed, followed by the Ottawa Agreements which were the greatest blunder and greatest crime any Government, of whatever nation, have committed. The world was faced by an accomplished fact. The Economic Conference was repeatedly postponed and when it was held, in 1933, it became a farce which



was rudely hissed off the stage. What Canada had done with its tariff in destroying agriculture and producing despair in the West was illustrated by the mental collapse of a whole people now worshipping the printing press as the distributor of a national dividend. Western Australia, similarly afflicted industrially, but not losing its head, proposes severance from the rest of the Commonwealth if it cannot otherwise enjoy the benefits of freedom to trade.

It was no wonder that with markets closed against them, or treated as the special perquisite of some nations, that countries like Japan Germany and Italy used the language of war in asserting the need for expansion or that, surrounded by the tariff walls they themselves built, they complained of being overpopulated, refusing the produce that the rest of the world could supply in overwhelming abundance.

In Great Britain, the Government called National had not only enforced the tariffs and its many schemes to uphold the rent of land but had also, without a mandate and in betrayal of its pledges, repealed the Land Value Tax and Land Valuation provisions of the first Finance Act of 1931 with its enormous promise for the future. Ministers of the Government in very shame of their action tried to get rid of their legislation in the fewest possible words but the Premier, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, (who had absented himself from all debates), was stung to an explanation by the public protest the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values had made. The letter he wrote in reply unwittingly but completely smashed the conspiracy of silence, for the Committee took care to let it be known through the Press that by virtual admission of the Prime Minister this National Government had simply obeyed the behests of the landed interests. It was the only possible explanation.

In conclusion, Mr. Madsen said it was argued that whether a country had protective tariffs or free imports the condition of the worker would be reduced to the same low level by the stranglehold of land monopoly. That was true in the long run, just as it was true that public education, improved sanitation and all material advance would be absorbed by the privileged receivers of rent under the law as now constituted. It showed how urgent was the land value policy and how essential it was to link that with free trade. But the economic injuries caused by protection were not the least. Far greater was the poisoning of the spirit, the moral corruption and degradation fostering suspicion and hate, making every man's neighbor his enemy, Ishmaelites not only in national spheres but in the everyday affairs of our individual lives.—*Land and Liberty*, London, England.

## Arthur Madsen at Banquet Henry George Congress

MR. MADSEN also conveyed greetings to the Congress, these being in the name of the British movement and in written messages and cables from many parts of the world, from Alaska to Cape Horn, from Australia, New Zealand and South Africa and from nearly all the countries of Europe exceptions being Portugal, Italy, Russia and the Baltic States. When they looked abroad to see what legislative progress had been made and the fellowship existing to promote their ideas they could in truth say that no social reformer had been so justified in his day and generation as Henry George.

In Great Britain, land value taxation was written into the programmes of the Liberal and Labor parties. Briefly sketching the nature of the campaign work conducted by the United Committee and the Leagues with the many agencies at their disposal, he traced Parliamentary history of the movement with its success and setbacks. Most important was what the municipalities had done and were doing in their official capacity, action that had been initiated years back in Glasgow by the pioneer work of Bailie Burt. Mentioning a number of large municipalities that had engaged in this agitation, he pointed to the lead now being given by the Cardiff City

Council which had just held a representative conference of Welsh counties and towns. There was a vast opportunity for organizing the forces that could speak to some purpose and in the wider national sphere as well, insisting on land value taxation as the way to both freedom of production and freedom of trade. He could not help reflecting on the misuse of the phrase *laissez faire* which rightly interpreted meant "let things be done," with all restrictions upon production removed. It was not a negative but a positive policy, a command to landlord, tax-gatherer and bureaucrat alike to get out of the way and give equal freedom a chance. It was another way of saying that the moral law must be observed, reminding him of a thought to which John Paul often recurred, and is the essence of the Henry George philosophy, that our civilization cannot flourish but is doomed if moral progress halts behind material progress. There was all the truth in the injunction of the prophet of old who cried: "Ye people rend your hearts and your garments" when affliction was among them.

So among us, poverty and unemployment prevailed, not through any fatality beyond our control but because of an elemental injustice for which the people themselves were responsible in their laws. Instead of bewailing the circumstances, rending our garments and trying now to make clothes of our tatters (which is what present day Governments are doing) we must fight the wrong and in our hearts assert the right whereby there shall be opportunity in abundance, wealth and happiness in abundance, for all the sons of men.

*Land and Liberty*, London, England.

## Tributes to Henry George

FROM THE ELECTORS OF THE HALL OF FAME  
AND OTHERS

IN this issue (see Comment and Reflection, page 180) will be found a reference to the recent election to the Hall of Fame, in which Henry George received fifty-six votes, five less than required to elect—Hon Edward Polak calls the vote "phenomenal" when it is borne in mind that Henry George received only three votes in 1925.

Mr. Polak was indefatigable in his labors to bring to the attention of the Electors the claims of this great American to a place among the immortals. In this work he had the cooperation of the secretary of the Schalkenbach Foundation, Miss Antoinette Kaufmann, its president Hon. Chas. O'Connor Hennessy, and Mrs. Anna George de Mille. Those who feel some disappointment at the result cannot accuse Mr. Polak and those who cooperated with him of failing to take advantage of the situation. Their work was admirable and unremitting.

The letters received from the Electors as well as the friends who urged upon them the claims of our leader are vastly interesting.

Hon. Josephus Daniels wrote as follows:

"I am giving myself the pleasure of writing to some of my friends to express the hope that the Electors of the Hall of Fame will include the name of Henry George among the great men of the Republic, for he deserves that honor."

Dan Beard, who needs no introduction to Single Tax readers, writes:

"I knew Henry George intimately. We would discuss principles and people, as friends may, but all the time I was talking or listening to him, I felt like standing hat in hand, because I realized that back of the man to whom I was talking, there was something big and great—bigger and greater than the generation in which we lived, understood, or that he himself realized—and that was the soul of the man himself."

Hon. Bennett Champ Clark: "I regard Henry George as a great man." Judge Burke of the Supreme Court of North Dakota said: "I have been an admirer of Henry George nearly all my life." Robert Davis of the *New York Sun* wrote: "Henry George should have been in the Hall of Fame thirty years ago." James Truslow Adams, author of a number of thoughtful books, wrote that he had decided



to vote for Henry George. William Allen White said: "He has meant much in my life and I know that he has stirred millions of men to thinking in terms of social welfare."

William E. Dodd, ambassador to Germany, wrote in a letter to Mrs. Post that when voting time came Henry George's name would be first on his list.

Ellen Glasgow, whose novels are perhaps the most notable of all similar output of our present generation, wrote as follows:

"In my early youth 'Progress and Poverty,' with its penetrating analysis of social conditions, made an indelible impression upon my memory. I have always regarded Henry George as one of our few important social philosophers. Certainly, he deserves, though he does not need, a place in the building we describe as our Hall of Fame."

Rabbi Wise was most emphatic:

"An American Hall of Fame without Henry George is an absurdity. Henry George was one of the greatest of Americans. He was seer, philosopher, prophet. We ask you not for Henry George's sake but for the sake of truth, to cast your ballot for him as one of those most deserving of inclusion within the Hall of Fame."

Letters were received from Hon. Robert Crosser, Albert Bushnell Hart, Prof. John R. Commons, and many others.

## What They Are Saying

### SIMPLICITY IN TAXATION

Followers of Henry George, at a recent convention here, reported an awakening interest in the teachings of the economist-philosopher, who died thirty-eight years ago.

We do not wish to say anything here that might involve us in an academic argument over the principles of the Single Tax, but merely wish to observe in passing that the harshest critics of the plan, even in the heyday of the prophet who held that land was the true source of all wealth, never denied that it possessed the merit of simplicity and, theoretically at least, of justice.

Who can say as much for our present tax system? It is not one of simplicity but one of vast confusion. And it is not equitable, either in theory or in practice.—*New York World Telegram*.

### WHY THE HOUSING PLAN DOESN'T WORK

- "1. The PWA makes a slum clearance allotment.
- "2. Agents of the PWA begin quietly to secure options on the needed real estate.
- "3. It becomes known that the PWA is taking options.
- "4. Land speculators rush into the district and take private options. Lawyers sign contracts with landowners for a percentage of all they can get from the government over a stated minimum.
- "5. Land prices go up and the government stops buying.
- "6. The slum clearance project is canceled."

—IRVING BRANT, editor *St. Louis Star Times* and prominent housing official.

### EVOLUTION DISPROVED

The final proof that men are not related to monkeys is furnished by the fact that no monkey has ever been found who will go hungry because there are too many coconuts or sleep on damp ground because there are too many trees.—*The Minnesota Leader*.

### THE JEWISH TIMES IS DISAPPOINTED

The name of William Penn, founder of Pennsylvania, was added to the galaxy of American immortals perpetuated in the Hall of Fame on the campus of New York University, according to a decision reached by the electors of the Hall of Fame last week, while that of Henry George, another famous Philadelphian, was rejected. William Penn, leader of the admirable Quaker sect which first settled this part of America, probably deserves this honor which has been bestowed upon his memory, but Henry George should, we believe,

deserve it even more. If Penn hadn't settled the Eastern Pennsylvania region, somebody else would have settled it later on. But who besides Henry George would have given to the world a book called, "Progress and Poverty," which was read by, and revolutionized the thinking of millions of people throughout the world on vital social and economic questions, which was translated into nearly every civilized language?—*The Jewish Times*, Philadelphia, Pa.

### HAVE DONE NOTHING TO SOLVE THEIR PROBLEM

Are you patriots, who like butter on your bread, and who enjoy club luncheons and bridge teas—are you surprised that hungry men listen to the promises of Communists or espouse the cause of Socialism? You needn't be. You have done nothing to solve their problem or to make it possible for them to enjoy that economic freedom that is their right—guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States that you defend so feverishly to confirm your boasted Americanism.—NORMA COOLEY in *Tax Facts*.

### WHITE PARASOLS

"White parasols and elephants mad with pride are the fruit of a grant of land." Henry George's quotation seems strangely pertinent somehow, to the Abyssinian situation, even if it can't be tacked onto that shortlived grant to American oil interests. The Abyssinia crisis centers in the ownership and control of land. The whole European problem, with whose solution the world's statesmen are now struggling, is at bottom a land problem.

—Winstead (Conn.) *Evening Citizen*.

### COL. HARLEE IS OUTSPOKEN

Our people once rebelled, in 1832, against the plan of imposing import taxes for the general public to pay to enable the lords of manufacturing industries to prosper at their expense, and nullified such laws and prepared to fight to prevent their operation. The prosperity of the lords of industry produced by the perversion of government to create monopolies for them has never spread to those who labored and produced the wealth, and never will. That kind of prosperity for the privileged few exploiters of labor has brought us to our present plight.

—COL. WM. C. HARLEE in his platform for U. S. Senator from South Carolina.

### MANY DOUBTFUL EXPERIMENTS

First we must face the fact that our country is now involved in a vast number of doubtful experiments. Granting that some of these experiments may succeed, it has become evident that many of them contradict laws that are as unchangeable as the law of gravitation and therefore must fail, for *man cannot repeal the laws of nature nor of nature's God*.—*Investor American*, Chicago, Ill.

### HALTING IMPROVEMENTS

The hopeless abandonment of the original low-rent housing project in South Boston by the Federal Government is an eloquent example of the ruthless and anti-social character of private landlordism. A few selfish individuals squatting with their title deeds on certain small and comparatively insignificant parcels of the earth's surface which at best they can encumber with their unaspiring bodies only a few brief years, are permitted by an unintelligent land policy to balk an improvement that would provide decent living conditions to many who sadly need them and which would enrich the lives of thousands of workers and producers in the creation of the proposed structures. All of Boston and its suburbs would have profited by this government enterprise.—FRANKLIN WENTWORTH in Wellesley, Mass., *Townsmen*.

SHOW your friend a copy of LAND AND FREEDOM.



## Where the Wealth Goes

OUT near the rim of Chicago on an unimportant street, ten miles from the City Hall, stands a drug store, on a plot of land that much less than forty years ago was farm land, miles from the city boundaries, valued at a few hundred dollars an acre. The plot of land on which this drug store stands was purchased not many years ago for \$77,000. The present owner now values it at \$90,000. That extra \$20,000 is *unearned increment* just as was the *original \$77,000* for the bare opportunity. The present owner however, paid \$77,000 cash for it and of course he calls it *capital value* and he wants *interest on his investment*. He has had three tenants to date and they all *went broke* and moved out. They could not make the rent and live also; so they quit. The owner then moved into the store and now runs it, both as landowner and business man and while it is safe to say that he will not move out as did the others because he cannot pay the rent, he will charge all the traffic will bear and that is of course all of the cream, all of the skimmed milk, and part of the whey; the balance will go to the customers, as usual. That is the process of division that goes on here and over most of the world. Now what was it the owner invested in when he bought that land? He could not earn that sum in raising garden truck on that land in two hundred years and live well in addition. What he invested in—without knowing it, in all probability—was \$77,000 worth of *tribute levying power*. Now just multiply that sum by the billions of square feet of land of equal area inside of that ten mile radius in three directions from the City Hall and make all the necessary deductions you please and you will still have left a sum of *ciphers backed by the law*, that staggers the imagination; a sum that the average human mind cannot possibly grasp.

Consider carefully the fact that that value is *land value*, that it is social value capitalized against the very people who have to pay interest on it and that this value can be expanded indefinitely. This value does not represent wages paid for work done. Nor does it represent interest paid on useful productive capital. It represents nothing whatever but the legal power to take wealth from industry without giving any wealth or service in return. Consider also that drugs and sundries are made by labor and not by law. Consider also that land value is made by law and not by labor and that were it not for the law's protection that land would not be worth seventy-seven cents and that if the law were abolished, the things made by labor would probably cost fifty or a hundred times more in terms of dollars than they do now and you will begin to see the *economic cavern* into which our local wealth pours in increasing and unceasing volume.

Here is the mammoth cave that with constant regularity and unvarying voracity absorbs labor's earnings,

and that the diameter and depth of this cave can be expanded and it will be always expanded as our wealth producing power increases. We, as a people, have reached a period in our economic history when we will have to take account of these facts and facts they certainly are. That \$77,000 purchase price for a little dinky lot ten miles from City Hall is more than twice as much as the city fathers sold the children's mile square of land for, School section No. 16—in *down town Chicago* 99 years ago. *Some fathers*, don't you think? And the rental of one little lot under the Rookery Building downtown returns in land rental alone every year a thousand dollars more than the Children got for the whole square mile just 99 years ago. Here is the real reason, the true reason why we are today a bankrupt municipality. The real bankruptcy is lack of information on immensely important questions. A bankruptcy that extends from Boston to San Francisco and includes them both. A bankruptcy that has involved the Federal government in five and a half billions of debt is less than two years. A system that mortgages the taxing powers of government years and years in advance to pay the expenses of government in the present and that in a country whose people are never tired of boasting of their wealth and wealth producing power. If this does not imply economic lunacy, the term lunacy has no meaning. It is only too obvious to any thinking citizen that the system is now operating as its own grave-digger. All false systems eventually do that and ours is rapidly following the sorry procession toward the cemetery which contains the gravestone of every fake system from the beginning of time down to the present moment.

To have permanency, a system must be just and it would be almost impossible to find a system or method that contains a greater sum of injustice than the one now operating in this country. That is why it is failing, and the compelling evidence of its failure is piling up mountain high, as the stores empty, the factories shut down, and the bread lines lengthen all over the land. Never in the history of man has such a spectacle been witnessed as can be seen in every center of population in this country. Deepening poverty and steadily increasing wealth producing power; the baldest and most irreconcilable contradiction imaginable. There is nothing in fiction like it. It is the riddle of the sphinx, which not to answer is to be destroyed, nor can the answer be much longer delayed. This system has not only undermined the prosperity and security of our workers, it is now relentlessly at work digging caverns under our prosperous classes who but a short time ago were preening their feathers and hugging no end of delusions as to the continuous upward swing of unparalleled inflation and thought they were wealthy and secure for all time. What has happened in two and a half years has abolished a local security, destroyed smugness, messed up many



great reputations for wisdom. Broken no end of idols, replaced security with alarm, filled kitchens with crusts and made simpletons of statesmen all over the world, and that is just as it should be and will be until we do some straight thinking on the subject of political economy.—HENRY H. HARDINGE.

AT a time when the "Three Estates" were the recognized groups of the French nation, Rochambeau wrote that in reality there were but two, "the privileged people and the unprivileged."

## BOOK REVIEWS

### CHAINING THE WAR GOD\*

Victor Alexander Rule has written a good book. He could have written a great book. A good book is characterized by a presentation that is interesting and entertaining. To be a great book it must be that and something more; it must carry such conviction that its theme acquires inevitability in the mind of the reader. In a book advocating change in the political or social order—propagandist in purpose—the measure of its greatness is the extent to which it convinces the reader as to the efficacy and justice of the reform proposed, and therefore stimulates a desire to see it put into practice.

It is because the subject of war as a denial of natural economic law has never, to my knowledge, been adequately presented; it is because I know that Col. Rule is capable of such a presentation that I choose to measure his book by the more difficult yardstick of greatness, rather than the moderate measure of goodness. And it is my sincere hope that he will follow this first volume, which should gain favor with all lovers of peace, with one in which the attack upon the fundamental cause of all wars—exploitation—is developed in such a way as to leave no doubt even in the minds of militarists that this, and this only, is the cause of war.

To every Georgeist the logic of this book is convincing. To one who is not familiar with Georgeist philosophy I am afraid the development of Col. Rule's thesis will not be so apparent. The syllogism does not seem to be carried out to a finality that resists refutation, and I believe this is due first, to the form of presentation, and secondly, the failure to prove the theory of "surplus wealth," its cause and its effects.

The form followed by the author is to analyze the proximate causes of war—the machinations of diplomats, the avarice of munition makers, the irritation of large armies and navies—and to show how none of these of themselves bring about armed conflicts. He discounts very ably the theory of population pressure as a cause of war. He sketches the various attempts to achieve universal peace and shows how and why they failed in their purpose and in fact often were the irritants that hastened the advent of wars. Thus, clearing away the obvious causes for war and the inadequacy of the popularly accepted devices for eliminating war (in ten chapters), he proceeds in two chapters to tell how the War God can be chained. The first of these chapters is entitled "With What Do Nations Fight?" and the answer is "credit." He advocates a tax on land value not only as a means for reducing national debt, but also as a deterrent to the patriot-landlords who clamor for, and profit from, war, but are not willing to pay for it. The next chapter, "For What Do Nations Fight?" reveals what he considers the fundamental cause of war—"surplus wealth" seeking profitable investment in the exploitation of subject peoples. (In this chapter Col. Rule indulges, for no good

reason at all, the obsession he shares with several Chicago Single Taxers, namely, that rent is expressed in price!) Then he devotes a chapter to showing that this "surplus wealth" is derived from land rent, and that the way to destroy this urge toward imperialistic enterprise is to socialize the rent of land. A short chapter on "What If War Should Come" serves only to bring out that the socialization of land rent would enrich our national coffers immensely for fighting purposes, and by removing the cause of poverty would develop a greater fighting morale in the citizens; but it naturally occurs that if the cure for war has been proven, why speculate on the possibility of war after the cure has been applied, unless, indeed, the author is not quite sure of himself?

Such, in brief, is the form of argument used in the book. It is through a process of elimination of other causes and cures that Col. Rule attempts to lead the reader to his (Rule's) conclusion. It is plausible inference, but not wholly convincing. There seems to be a hiatus in the reasoning. Might not another author, believing that wars arise from some innate desire of man to fight, a sort of sadistic propensity of the human being, continue the process of elimination and just as plausibly eliminate the "surplus wealth" theory as well? Might not another author, accepting this theory, advocate the abolition by law of foreign investments as a means of stopping war? Indeed, Col. Rule does not explain why there were wars before there were foreign investments. What foreign investments did the Romans have in Gaul when Caesar led his legions over the Alps? And how does the "surplus wealth" theory explain our own Indian wars? "Chaining the War God" does not prove its case.

"Surplus wealth"—an expression that is quite descriptive, but somewhat abhorrent to me because borrowed from socialistic phraseology—is that part of wealth produced by capital and labor which is diverted from their rightful owners to the pockets of landowners. This diversion is possible because of the monopoly of land. Were land free, that is, if its accessibility were open to all on equal terms, this wealth would naturally flow to its rightful owners, labor and capital. The freeing of the land from private ownership is to be attained by socialization of rent. In this way the wealth of which labor and capital is robbed, and which is far in excess of the personal requirements of landowners, would not accumulate in the hands of a few, who find it necessary to invest it in further exploitation. Finding their home markets glutted because of the citizens' inability to consume more goods—due to the very robbing of them by the landlords—foreign markets are sought for the investment of this "surplus wealth." In these foreign markets, however, these investments come in conflict with the loot of landlords from other countries also seeking fields for exploitation. The struggle for markets then becomes an irritant which results in armed conflict. The way to eliminate a troublesome competitor is to secure a monopoly. With a large army and navy you simply prevent him by brute force from entering your field; if he also has an army and navy, a fight ensues.

While Col. Rule does explain this source of "surplus wealth" (and the land-value-tax method of destroying it), he does not, it seems to me, convincingly show that its search for foreign fields of investment is the primary cause of wars. Nor does he give sufficient emphasis to the idea that the abolition of poverty, through the elimination of land speculation, would create a social condition repulsive to the idea of war. The militarist would find the self-satisfied citizen, with lots to live for, quite unresponsive to his appeal to commit murder, and to subject himself to the same possibility.

The absence of any reference to tariff walls as a cause of war is a rather unexpected omission in this book. Germany, a manufacturing nation in the main, found itself unable to market its products in other countries because of "protective tariffs, and therefore sought outlets in Africa, Asia and South America. Then it came into conflict with the agents of "surplus wealth" from England and France. Its "place in the sun" denied it, Germany went to war. It is true that tariffs are another expression or creation of "surplus wealth,"

\*Chaining the War God by Col. Victor A. Rule. Cloth, 12 mo., 306 pp. Price \$2.25. James A. Bell, Elkhart, Ind., Publisher.



but as a proximate irritant of war this stoppage of the free exchange of wealth is too manifest to be entirely ignored in a book on this subject. As a matter of record, the Civil War between the American states was caused primarily by the economic antagonism of the "free trade" South and the "protected" North.

Col. Rule's book, valuable as it is, leaves something undone. The world needs to be shown, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, that poverty is the real cause of war, and that the abolition of poverty is the only cure, that the urge to escape from conditions of poverty is the force which directs peoples' eyes, and those of their rulers, to other peoples' lands.

Proceeding from the economic axiom that man seeks to satisfy his desires with the least amount of effort, and that war is the exertion of utmost effort, the subject of war could be treated in such a way as to show why this contradiction manifests itself. The reason can be found in the attempt to frustrate the operation of natural economic law. Having arrived at this first premise, the scientific approach would be to apply this premise to the test by analyzing the causes of, and conditions precedent to, a number of major wars throughout history. Thus our premise of the economic cause of war would be proven by logic and by example.

Such an approach to the subject of war, by one endowed with research ability and the power of logical expression, would be a valuable contribution to the Georgist philosophy, as well as to the literature of the peace movement. It is needed.

Col. Rule's "Chaining the War God" is a good book. Every student of Henry George should read it. A familiarity with this book will help us to demonstrate to the constantly increasing number of peace advocates that in our philosophy alone can they find the real answer to their prayers. It is as good propaganda for Single Tax as it is for peace, and it is very interestingly written, in the oratorical style of which the author is a master.—FRANK CHODOROV.

#### OUR ENEMY, THE STATE\*

Now and then a thinker breaks through the yearly billions of printed words with real thoughts ably expressed and logically presented. Such a book is "Our Enemy, The State," by Albert Jay Nock. To read it is to feel like a traveller lost on a dark road and a bright flash of lightning shows him where he is—where he is going.

Nock distinguishes government from The State, as he does religion from the organized church. He treats the historical developments of the power of the State and its present increasing power. The book traces in detail government and The State in America from the earliest colonial days through the American Revolution with its ideals of a free people—a true democracy—and shows that with the increasing power of the State man even in the United States seems made for the State instead of the State for man. How true that was in the World War when men were conscripted, but not property!

The State, Nock shows, obtaining too much power becomes a parasitic growth, feeding on civilization and destroying the social consciousness and the self reliance of the people. He condemns the State "lock, stock and barrel."

Nock wants the citizen to look very closely into the institution of the State. He wants him to ask how the State originated and why, and what is the State's primary function, and then to decide whether by the testimony of history the State is to be regarded in essence as a social or anti-social institution. He presents the Single Tax theory as a perfect solution of our economic problems, and a solution that still leaves men free from the juggernaut of the State.

Under the Roosevelt administration, faced by the present emergency, the centralized government, Nock shows, has grown by leaps and bounds, the government more and more wiping out State lines, piling up the public debt, taking larger and larger parts of the people's income to support its horde of agents. He shows the centralized

State, by what is called a planned economy, creating a scarcity of production, raising the cost of living artificially—while millions cannot pay the present price of food and clothing and shelter.

Nock points out that when the disastrous Johnstown flood occurred socialized power was immediately mobilized and applied with intelligence and vigor. That a beggar now usually asks in vain for a handout. In both instances of a large or small catastrophe, we all almost instinctively now say "let the government do it." The government does—at great expense, inefficiently, and with an added number to its cohorts, which like the seven-year locusts eat up the harvests of the land.

The other day I was in the country and the long drought had dried up most of the wells and springs of the countryside. On the main road was a perpetual spring that some one years ago had built a wall around to protect it. Many people were getting their water from it. Over the spring were some boards that had rotted. I said, "Let's get some boards to cover the spring properly and keep the dust and leaves out." Someone replied: "Let the town do it." Yes, let the town do it. Call it to the attention of the Town Council to go through the red tape to get a board, to get a man to go with a car, to cover the spring—all at the community's expense and increased taxes.

The author points out that outside of poorhouses and hospitals and such institutional enterprises—destitution and unemployment were usually relieved by what he calls the "social power" of the people. He then states:

"Under Mr. Roosevelt, however, the State assumed this function, publicly announcing the doctrine, brand-new in our history, that the State owes its citizens a living. Students of politics, of course, saw in this merely an astute proposal for a prodigious enhancement of State power."

This is not exactly true or fair in my opinion, and nowhere does Nock point out that Roosevelt was faced with a depression and tremendous unemployment, with millions of men and women ready, able and willing to work and unable to find work. Roosevelt, *not* knowing the remedy for unemployment and the depression, and in order to prevent a revolution, chose the "dole," work-relief, N.R.A., depreciated money and plowing under cotton and pig killing and cutting down production in various ways to raise prices. I believe Roosevelt's fear was not a groundless fear. Millions would not starve peacefully in a land of plenty. Was it the town of English, out west where farmers threatened to take food by force if not fed? No greater surprise to the American people could have happened. I further doubt that all these steps of grasping power was deliberate and intentional, though Roosevelt was glad to have billions of dollars to spend, which incidentally helped build up his political machine.

Nock says:

"Practically all the sovereign rights and powers of the smaller political units—all of them that are significant enough to be worth absorbing—have been absorbed by the federal unit; nor is this all. State power has not only been thus concentrated at Washington, but it has been so far concentrated into the hands of the Executive that the existing regime is a regime of personal government."

He then adds:

"This regime was established by a coup d'etat of a new and unusual kind, practicable only in a rich country. It was effected not by violence, like Louis-Napoleon's, or by terrorism, like Mussolini's, but by purchase."

If increasing prosperity should come, and the wheels of industry really begin to revolve, and the work be available more generally, I believe the revolt of the tax payer, aided by the press, will cut down a goodly portion of this conversion of social power into State power, even though Nock believes we are "a people little gifted with intellectual integrity."

He further believes that:

"The method of direct subsidy, or sheer cash-purchase, will therefore in all probability soon give way to the indirect method of what is called "social legislation," that is, a multiplex system of State-managed pensions, insurance and indemnities of various kinds."

\*By Albert Jay Nock. 12 mo. Clo. 209 pp. Price \$2.25. William Morrow & Co., N. Y. City.



and believing that we are moving toward the collectivist's aim of complete extinction of social power through absorption by the State, he says:

"It may be in place to remark here the essential identity of the various extant forms of collectivism. The superficial distinctions of Fascism, Bolshevism, Hitlerism, are the concern of journalists and publicists; the serious student sees in them only the one root-idea of a complete conversion of social power into State power."

The author bitterly opposes the government taking over public utilities and other public monopolies, or any other industries, as he sees the centralized government "managing them with ever increasing corruption, inefficiency and prodigality, and finally resorting to a system of forced labor." I personally believe that under the *present* system public utilities cannot be properly regulated, as they control the government. The citizen is on the horns of a dilemma of choosing to be exploited on the one hand by public utilities and being governed by them in addition, or allowing the State to own and operate them.

Nock, as stated before, carefully distinguishes the State from government; showing one being based on force and theft, and the other based on the consent of the governed; the State being an instrument for exploitation of one class by another, and government being an instrument for the protection of liberty and security and justice between individuals. He carefully shows that from the earliest days of history conquerors always confiscated the land and natural resources, compelling the conquered to pay tribute. That only the assumption of the justice of things as they are, aided by the school system, the press and the churches, prevent the people from examining the right of those who by conquest or theft parcelled out the land, and continue to levy tribute on those who wish to use it. He shows that William the Conqueror invaded England and divided its land among his followers. He shows that the foul factory system of England—and incidentally ours—could not have grown up except that the people had been denied access to the land. He shows how the Indians in America were wiser than we are in the use of the land.

One of the fundamental reasons for the American Revolution, Nock contends, was the desire on the part of many of the leading colonists to obtain access to the vast land of the west, England having in 1736 forbade the colonists to take up land lying westward of the source of any river flowing through the Atlantic seaboard. He makes clear that "land speculation may be put down as the first major industry established in Colonial America." He shows the ideal of the Declaration of Independence and Thomas Jefferson for a free people with free access to the land.

Our author believes, pointing the Single Tax remedy, that "Our Enemy the State," can be shorn of its power, until it is merely a government "of the people, by the people, for the people." He gives enough of the Henry George theory so that those who have the intelligence can understand, and those who desire the full argument on behalf of the Single Tax are pointed to "Progress and Poverty" for study. He succinctly states:

"The first postulate of fundamental economics is that man is a land-animal, deriving his subsistence wholly from land. His entire wealth is produced by the application of labor and capital to land; no form of wealth known to man can be produced in any other way. Hence, if his free access to land be shut off by legal preemption, he can apply his labor and capital only with the landholder's consent, and on the landholder's terms; in other words, it is at this point, and this point only, that exploitation becomes practicable."

and bitingly holds:

"it is interesting to observe that although all our public policies would seem to be in process of exhaustive review, no publicist has anything to say about the State system of land-tenure. This is no doubt the best evidence of its importance."

Nock, of course, believes in free trade. He says of tariffs:

"We all know pretty well, probably, that the primary reason for a tariff is that it enables the exploitation of the domestic consumer by a process indistinguishable from sheer robbery."

Though he adds in a footnote:

"It must be observed, however, that free trade is impracticable so long as land is kept out of free competition with industry in the labor-market."

He does not sufficiently show to one unfamiliar with the Single Tax theory, how society by taking the economic rent would simplify the government and do away with hordes of government officials. A fuller discussion of that, with a few examples of how the Single Tax would eliminate tens of thousands of custom officials, income tax investigators, etc., and the present horde of bureaucrats who are helping the unemployed (sic), would have made it clearer to the uninitiated reader.

Nock pleads for the small subdivisions of government where each citizen can take part, and learn self-reliance and the pride of citizenship by actually solving local problems—rather than having a centralized bureau dominate, control and possibly enslave. He explains the continuance of our present system as follows:

"The persistence of our unstable and iniquitous economic system is not due to the power of accumulated capital, the force of propaganda, or to any force or combination of forces commonly alleged as its cause. It is due solely to a certain set of terms in which men think of the opportunity to work; they regard this opportunity as something to be given. Nowhere is there any other idea about it than that the opportunity to apply labor and capital to natural resources for the production of wealth is not in any sense a right but a concession. This is all that keeps our system alive. When men cease to think in those terms, the system will disappear, and not before."

The future is not as dark as Nock sees it—and his book put into the hands of 10,000 editors and teachers of the country, thinking business and professional men, might help stave off the coming despotism. This book in the hands of one man—Franklin D. Roosevelt—and studied and understood by him—would stop the growing bureaucracy, for while Roosevelt is a politician and wants re-election (I believe his motives are sincere) his understanding of the way out of the depression is darkened by too much counsel, by a "brain trust," which now more clearly is seen to be what I called it, almost two years ago, "brain dust."

This book if carefully read by those with intelligence will be found as startling and as devastating as the establishment of the fact that the world was round or of Newton's law of gravitation.

Men of America, I believe, are still lovers of liberty—though in desperation to find an economic solution of the depression they may have acquiesced or submitted to experiments economic and governmental, along the road of State despotism. The men and women of America, will not, I believe, sell their birthright of liberty for a mess of pottage.—HARRY WEINBERGER, of the New York Bar.

## Correspondence

FROM THE SON OF JUDGE ROBERT MINOR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. E. P. Haye tells me that you have asked for an outline of the life of my father, Robert Berkeley Minor, who died here June 19, 1935, in his eighty-fourth year. His last illness interrupted his twenty-third year as judge of the 57th District Court of Texas, and a half century of earnest effort on behalf of the Single Tax movement. Manuscripts found among his papers give evidence of his repeated attempts to secure legislation enacting its principles.

This is written in his library, and round about are many volumes of Henry George. All are worn and thumb marked. One, of "Progress and Poverty," became so tattered in use that it required re-binding to preserve the copious notes and marginal references his interest inspired. From the edges of them all hang the straggly ends of page markers—grocery store string—marking his favorite passages. I believe you will understand as I did what he meant when he whispered, rather wistfully, just before he died, "There is so much to do—so much."



He was born in the ancestral home, Edgewood, Hanover County, in the James River country of Virginia, in 1851. The great cry for enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law sounded from the North in that year and grew to a rumble of gunfire during his "conditioning years." In the sudden joining of battle at Chancellorsville his older brothers, soldiers in the Confederacy, dug a hole in the ground and sat him in it when he was caught there as a messenger boy of twelve, come to bring them fresh meat. His and his family's hatred of the institution of slavery was equalled only by their devotion to the cause of the States' right to settlement of their own problems.

The Reconstruction, striking desolation upon his people and hopelessness upon his youthful spirit, set him off to the new frontier, Texas, in 1878. He taught a school for boys near San Antonio for several years, then came here as clerk in the Maverick Land Office. The old files of that institution are mines of color in stories of that and earlier periods of Texas history, when the vast domain of the cattleman and sheep rancher was disputed by the first dirt farmers. Strangely intercurrent just here, there came to his attention at this time some reflections by a San Francisco newspaper writer on "Our Land and Land Policy." Little from this Western writer's pen escaped him thereafter.

With a background of courses in Latin and Greek, in Engineering and in Law in the University of Virginia, my father chose the latter and was admitted to the bar in 1886. He became a stout champion of the United Labor Party led by Henry George in far away New York in that year. He never lost this enthusiasm. Ever cautious against fanaticism he would tear at the Georgian preachments ruthlessly, testing, weighing, seeking conflicts with its enemies, always strengthening his convictions—and winning converts.

He was elected City Attorney of San Antonio in the nineties, returned to private practice at the turn of the century, headed the state board that codified the jumbled laws of Texas in 1910, and in 1912 was elected to the judgeship he gave up in death.

San Antonio, Texas.

JOE H. MINOR.

### THE CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The California campaign is warming up rather rapidly even though the election is nearly a year away. Our enemies are unmasking their batteries. Coming into the open we have against us the State Chamber of Commerce, State Board of Equalization (controlling among other matters the administration of the sales tax), the various Real Estate Boards and some farm organization officials.

On the other hand we find an apparently united body of labor organizations, all leading bodies being unanimously committed to our measure, earnest and intelligent support from the entire number of Labor papers, some twenty or more, scattered newspaper support in addition, as well as the aid of certainly a big percentage of the Epic group.

We have virtually three regular offices in the State, the center of work. In San Francisco Mr. Noah D. Alper is in charge at 83 McAllister Street; in Los Angeles, Franklin Lowney at Philharmonic Building, and in San Diego, E. M. Stangland at 2660 National Avenue. These are the centers of distribution of all our literature.

It seems appropriate that the first wide struggle for the attainment of a large share of the ideas of Henry George should be the State which first saw his great production. For all the prior attempts or successes have been on a small scale or did not involve sufficient revenues to signify all that we would have them mean. Here, however, we have five per cent of the people of the United States and our measure, taking taxation off tangible personal property and improvements, involves a shift of not far from one hundred fifty millions in taxes and a contribution to the State and its subordinate jurisdictions of fifty to sixty per cent of the economic rental value.

This measure will be fought with all the virulence which would have greeted an attempt to make a complete transfer of all other

taxes to land values, and the question arises why should not therefore the fight have been made for the whole rental value. The answer is easy. We can only succeed by the votes of those who are willing to join us. To them we have proof to make. They would not have been willing to go the whole distance. They apparently were and are willing to carry into effect the present undertaking. We are in a war, which must be fought much as would be a military campaign. We can remind ourselves of the words of General N. B. Forrest, who is quoted as saying that the whole art of war was "to get there fustest with the mostest men." If with an appeal to the majority we can get half way today we can leave the future to take care of itself. If our plan of reform is correct it will justify itself so that there will be no fear of a backward step.

Will we succeed in the present campaign? I can assure you the California fight will not be ended till we do win. As for the present, our greatest hopes are founded upon the panicky fears of our opponents, who realize the strength of our call upon the public. The papers of the State fifty times over have disclosed this attitude.

The greatest restriction upon our activity is found in the want of money. While our opponents have a right to make demands upon the longest pocketbooks in the State we work with relatively almost nothing. Our friends in the State supply half of what should be our minimum necessities. We have received of late appreciated and increasing sums from scattered friends throughout the United States, but vastly too little for our real needs.

We cannot say too strongly that the fight we are making is the fight of the whole United States, and that all contributors are helping themselves and even their children's children.

Finally I am glad to note that Mrs. Anna George De Mille is now in Los Angeles, and will shortly aid us in San Francisco. We count greatly upon her assistance especially with the Women's Clubs. May we hope that all friends will consider California for their next vacation ground and help us by their presence and money!

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

### SOCIALISTS HELP IN READING, PA.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In presuming to make suggestions about Single Tax progress I am somewhat influenced by an unusual experience: The City of Reading, Pa., now systematically assesses real estate with separate land and improvement values, which is essential to the applying of Single Tax. The movement was started by the Reading Chamber of Commerce, in expectation of the so-called Pittsburgh law being extended to third class cities in Pennsylvania. The Chamber bore the expense of making sample appraisements of eight city blocks and employed the Manufacturer's Appraisal Co.; the different foot-frontage values, however, being determined by public meetings. These appraisements were made use of by succeeding Republican and Democratic city administrations, but they were not extended to the whole city as hoped for;—until a Socialist administration came in and immediately employed the same Manufacturer's Appraisal Co. in applying the Somer's system to the entire city. This was done after a friendly conference with our Chamber of Commerce Tax Committee.

How did this happen,—with Socialists notoriously unfriendly to Chambers of Commerce and distrustful of all their doings? Simply because Socialist leaders were convinced, by investigation, that it was a movement in good faith in a direction they wanted to go,—and they carried it through. I was Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Committee and Single Tax was freely talked at this conference. Reading, Pa.

W. G. STEWART.

### WE DO NOT AGREE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am delighted to find Frank Chodorov saying in your last issue that such reform as Abolition are based entirely upon sentiment and that their advocates have nothing to teach. This is correct; and it



applies as well to Prohibition, the Townsend Pension Plan, EPIC, Father Coughlin's drive for Social Justice, Huey Long's share-the-wealth movement, etc.

I was sorry, however, to see that Chodorov also said that the followers of Henry George "must eventually enter the political arena."

The two positions are inconsistent, particularly in view of his statement in the preceding paragraph that what has been holding up the Georgeist movement is the misunderstanding of those who ignorantly believe that landlordism is a beneficial system and that attacks upon it are attacks upon our security.

He is correct, of course, in saying that it is this lack of understanding that has brought it about that the selfishness of men has so stubbornly blocked our path; but why can he not see that, if properly instructed, these same selfish people would be just as selfishly stubborn in support of the Georgeist plan? What he says about the people's lack of understanding in this matter is merely another way of saying that, if instructed, their instinct of self-preservation would be enlisted on our side.

Upon his own testimony, therefore, I insist that we would be disloyal to the Georgeist cause to take time out from our teaching to take any part in the political arena. That is not our place. Rather is it our place to teach, teach, teach—thereby to loosen the avalanche of instinctive self-preservative activity on the part of the people that will carry our cause to victory. Any selfish ignoramus can do the necessary political work; but we Georgeists must do the teaching.

Teach, teach! Let instinct do the rest!

Stockton, Calif.

L. D. BECKWITH.

#### A LETTER TO BOLTON HALL

DEAR MR. HALL:

Mr. Villard, who has had to leave for the West, has asked me to say that he has read the extract from LAND AND FREEDOM which you sent to him. He wishes you to know that he has not been responsible for any articles or editorials that have appeared in *The Nation* for the last three years, he having laid down the editorship that long ago. The fastening of the responsibility upon him in this article is therefore entirely unjust.

MAUDE L. KIMBERELY,  
Secretary to Oswald Garrison Villard.

#### SOMETHING MORE ABOUT LEVESON GOWER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I was very much intrigued by the item in last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM about Morris Van Veen's purchase of a copy of "Progress and Poverty" containing a review of the book from the *London Times* of September 14, 1882. It sent me scurrying on one of my private pastimes, namely, looking up data in the library.

The review in the *Times* covers four columns and is unsigned, as are all reviews in the *Times* to this day, excepting the *Weekly News Supplement*.

I doubt very much whether Leveson Gower (pronounced Lawson-Gore) wrote it. He belonged to the family of the Duke of Sutherland who were never particularly enthusiastic about land reform of any sort, particularly George's doctrine.

But Lady Dorothy Nevill in her Reminiscences refers to him as a "gentle radical" though he was an aristocrat by birth and training. He often had Gladstone as a guest at his home.

Having a copy of "Progress and Poverty" in his possession stamps him, I should say, as a student of political questions. He did not always see eye to eye with his landowning relatives and may have leaned to the Single Tax theory.

This not does not make the question of authorship any clearer, but I was glad of the chance to dig up this much.

N. Y. City

MAURICE FIRTH.

#### EDMUND P. DONOVAN THROWS FURTHER LIGHT ON THE QUESTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am pleased to try and throw a little light on the query raised in the current number of LAND AND FREEDOM, regarding the copy of "Progress and Poverty" purchased by Mr. Van Veen.

The owner of the book, the Hon. Frederick Leveson Gower, was a son of Sir George Leveson Gower. I do not think, however, that he was responsible for the review preserved from the *London Times* which Mr. Van Veen found in the book. It is quite possible that his son who was Private Secretary to William Ewart Gladstone, from 1880 to 1885, while Gladstone was Prime Minister, afterwards representing Northwest Staffordshire as liberal member of Parliament, and was also European Editor of the *North American Review* in England from 1899 to 1908, was author of the review in question.

It is also interesting to note that another Leveson Gower was closely associated with Gladstone in his Cabinet. This was George Leveson Gower, Second Earl of Granville, who was Under Secretary for Affairs in Lord Melbourne's Ministry and prominent free trade leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Lords in 1855, and leader of the opposition after the Gladstone Ministry was defeated. He was Colonial Secretary in the First Gladstone Ministry in 1868, Foreign Secretary in 1870 and 1880-1885. He supported Gladstone on the Home Rule Question in 1886. This branch of the family were always active supporters of the Liberal Party in England at that time, and should not be confused with another branch of the family of the Duchy of Sutherland,—one member, Frederick Nevill Sutherland Leveson Gower, who sat as Liberal Unionist Member for Sutherland from 1900-1906, the Liberal Unionists, as you know, being that branch of the conservative party which split when Joseph Chamberlain first advocated his protectionist policy of Tariff Reform.

I trust you will find this information useful.

N. Y. City.

EDMUND P. DONOVAN.

#### THERE WAS A MAN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I will remember Frank Stephens who died June 16, 1935, not as an economist, not as a fighter for economic justice, not as a writer, not as an orator, but as a fearless soul, a believer in liberty and an opponent of war who wrote a great letter that should be as famous as Nathan Hale's "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

Frank Stephens and his son Donald, who were pacifists and opposed the World War, walked in to the White House the day after Mr. Wilson went before Congress and asked for a Declaration of War, and delivered the letter to Assistant Secretary Foster to be delivered to the President.

The letter reads as follows:

MR. PRESIDENT:

The bloodguilt of this war is upon you and neither you nor the law shall make me a sharer in it. I will neither kill nor help kill.

When it seems expedient to you, as it soon must, to make an example by punishment of those who will not obey your war laws and who appeal to others not to obey them I offer myself for that service to my country.—FRANK STEPHENS.

Nathan Hale may have been sorry he had but one life to lose for his country. He had no choice but to lose it, but greater than that was this courageous act of Frank Stephens.

During the war he was indicted under the Espionage Law for giving reasons for refusing to buy liberty bonds and after a trial was acquitted. Donald Stephens spent nine months in jail as a pacifist who refused to be registered and drafted.

Father and son—they opposed war in the time of war, when governments, people and the press were insane on the subject.

Frank Stephens never weighed his opinions by the tides of time, or the opinions of friends. There was a man.

N. Y. City.

HARRY WEINBERGER.



## PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

The Economic League of Ohio has reprinted in neat pamphlet form the report of the special committee of the American Institute of Architects in 1932. Of this committee W. R. B. Wilcox was chairman. The title of the pamphlet is "Why Penalize Building?"

Ohio bobs up again with a pamphlet from Peter Witt of Cleveland, "How Economic Ignorance Causes Depressions." It comprises sixteen pages and is sold for ten cents a copy. Those who know Peter Witt will know that the job is well done.

Two other pamphlets need to be noticed. Both hail this time from Pittsburgh. "The McNair Five to One Plan" and "The Economics of Henry George" from the pen of John C. Rose. The first named is dedicated to the memory of Francis W. Maguire and the price is ten cents per copy.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

"Land and Freedom," by Frederick Verinder, London, England.  
 "Land and Unemployment," by James F. Muirhead, M. A. L. H. D.  
 "Abram S. Hewitt," by Allan Nevins.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

MRS. EMILY E. F. SKEEL writes us: "Your last issue was a feast. I wonder afresh how you get such a meaty and salty meal on a topic with which we are all so familiar. Your readers are to be congratulated." Will Lissner of the *New York Times* also comments as follows: "By the way the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM is particularly good."

A RECENT article in the *New York Sun* gives an interesting account of the life and achievements of Bolton Hall. It is flippant enough to attract the attention of the casual newspaper reader but we will not quarrel about it.

ONE of the New York tabloids, the *Daily Mirror* of Oct. 1, contained an editorial on Henry George in which the writer says: "Some day George's hope will be realized, all men will own the earth." Then in an amateurish way the writer wanders off the reservation with the following: "But first they must own themselves and they must control themselves and they must think for themselves." May we not point out to the *Mirror* that no man can own himself when that from which he must derive his sustenance, the earth, is owned by others.

A SUBSCRIBER in Middletown, N. Y., desires the source of the quotation: "The stairway of history continually resounds with wooden sabots going up and silken sandals coming down."

HON. EUGENE TALMADGE, governor of Georgia, writes to Harold Sudell of Brookline, Pa.: "Your letter to the *Philadelphia Ledger* is good and contains some food for thought."

ANTONIO BASTIDA has returned from Cuba and is now living in Los Angeles.

ROBERT L. MCCAIG of Erie, Mich., is interested, as some of our readers know, in a portable house proposition. In one of these he now lives. He believes his idea will do much to advance the cause. Those who may be interested are invited to communicate with Mr. McCaig and get some explanatory literature that he will be glad to send.

Two books will appear shortly, one by Henry Ware Allen, entitled "Prosperity," to be issued by the Christopher Company of Boston.

Another forthcoming work is entitled "The Road to Prosperity," by Gilbert M. Tucker, to be published by Putnam's Sons of this city. Adequate reviews of both of these works will appear in LAND AND FREEDOM.

*Forbes*, a well known business magazine published in this city, quotes from LAND AND FREEDOM on what we had to say about wages not being drawn from capital.

ROBERT H. JACKSON of Jamestown, N. Y., delivered a remarkable address at the dedication of the High School in that city. Several years ago he made an address in which he quoted extensively from "Progress and Poverty" and on this occasion he wrote a letter to our old friend and veteran in the cause Frank G. Anderson of Jamestown as follows:

"I am always interested to hear from men who have studied George and whether you agree with all his conclusions or not, it must be admitted that he was one of the most profound students of the past century. I am a believer in most of his teachings."

Mr. Jackson is a friend of the son-in-law of Mr. Anderson and has been prominently spoken of for the governorship of the State.

ED DOTY died Nov. 12 at the age of seventy-two, and it is with real sorrow that we chronicle the death of an old friend and correspondent. Ed Doty (he was always called Ed) was for many years a newspaper man and a staunch advocate of the Henry George philosophy. He was clerk of the Ohio House of Representatives for two sessions and was appointed by Newton D. Baker when the latter was mayor, as Secretary of the City Sinking Fund. He was a close friend of Tom L. Johnson. Cleveland has lost a strong advocate of our movement, fearless and uncompromising. He had a keen sense of humor and was a most lovable personality. We shall miss him greatly.

"London's Gold Mine" is a four-page leaflet by Frederick Verinder in which is given instances of the fortunes buried in London sites. The figures are startling enough. A quotation from a speech made by W. E. Gladstone many years ago is arresting and is as follows:

"We have just been driving along your magnificent Embankment. But at whose expense was that great permanent and stable improvement made? Instead of being made, as it should have been, mainly at the expense of the permanent proprietary interests, it was charged, every shilling of it, either upon the wages of the laboring man in fuel necessary for his family, or upon the trade and industry and enterprise which belong of necessity to a vast Metropolis like this."

A VIGOROUS attack on the Townsend Plan appears in *The Broom* of San Diego, Calif. Our congratulations to Brother De Aryan. He is of a type that we might well have more of a brave, uncompromising advocate with a splendid ability to use English.

THE Springfield, Mo., *Leader and Press* contains an account of the formation of a Henry George School in that city. A portrait of Dr. J. V. Boswell, the teacher of the School, accompanies the article. Dr. Boswell is an old time Single Taxer with whom the Schalkenbach Foundation and John Lawrence Monroe recently established contacts. The article, which is a good presentation of our philosophy, quotes Dr. Boswell who is, we believe, an exceptional teacher.

OUR friend Prof. Matheu Alonso of Salamanca, Spain, writes to *La Reforma Social* that on his recent visit to Leningrad he saw but little of any deep-seated poverty. Nevertheless, the people look poor and are poor. Poverty has its various phases and we gather that while there is no starvation there is a dead level of depression among the people, few comforts and no luxuries.

E. W. NICOLAUS, editor of *The Commonwealth* of New Zealand has been nominated by the Commonwealth Land Party for representative from East Wellington at the next general elections. Mr. Nicholaus organized the Wayside Club in Wellington in 1931. The club oc-



cupies an entire floor of a large building in which there is a reading room, a class room and a lecture hall. An average of 250 men pass through these rooms daily. We shall give news of the outcome of the campaign which will be watched with interest in many parts of the world outside Wellington.

HON. WILLIAM D. GRIMES, newly appointed City Solicitor of Pittsburgh, Pa., reviewed Albert Jay Nock's recent book, "Our Enemy the State," before the Henry George Club of that city. The same work is reviewed by Harry Weinberger in this issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

A LIFE-LONG Henry George disciple, Leland P. Shidy, is dead in Stockton, Calif., at the age of eighty-four. He was for many years head of the Geodetic Survey in Washington. He was considered one of the foremost tidal experts of his time. He was long a subscriber to this paper.

*The Roman Forum* for November, edited by Dr. Frederick W. Roman at Los Angeles, is a notable number. The articles by Dr. Roman are a real contribution to progressive thought. The Henry George School is not neglected and generous portions are allotted to its consideration. The Roman forums are listed and are proofs of the fine constructive work that is in progress.

SUPERIOR JUDGE JOHN M. WILSON of Thurston County, Wash., has enjoined the state tax commission from collecting the sales tax in a suit begun by John D. Morrow who is a Seattle cafe operator. Mr. Morrow is a son of our friend, State Senator Frank P. Morrow. The order restraining the tax commission from using money tokens is on the ground that taxes can be paid only in lawful money.

AN admirable review of Albert Nock's book, "Our Enemy the State," appears from the pen of David Gibson in the *Lorain (O.) Journal* and also in the *Sandusky Daily News* and the *Mansfield News Journal*, all of Ohio.

HON. WILLIAM N. MCNAIR, Mayor of Pittsburgh, addressed a meeting at Fairhope, Ala., early in November. He detailed the progress being made in his city.

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY of Tacoma, Wash., writes: "In my judgment you are doing wisely to omit from LAND AND FREEDOM the hair-splitting controversies. We will cross these bridges when we come to them. We have, just now, one great big vital thing to do."

MR. GEORGE E. ROBERTS of the National City Bank has written a fine letter of endorsement to D. L. Thompson, of Spokane, Wash., on the latter's pamphlet "Our Deluded Overproductionists," reviewed in Sept.-Oct. LAND AND FREEDOM.

"DARKEST AFRICA OF ECONOMICS" is the title of a large four-page leaflet by A. A. Whipple, of Wenatchee, Wash.

J. H. KAUFFMAN of Columbus, O., in a letter to the Henry George Congress called attention to a paragraph in the *Dictionary of American Biography* published in 1931 in which it is said of Henry George that "he was not only perfectly original but accomplished a synthesis and gave his message a singular force and beauty."

N. D. ALFER, who is helping Judge Ralston in his campaign in California, writes: "A topsy-turvy world leans towards isms strange to the ideals of democracy. In a world surcharged with various breeds of dictatorship only a quick reversal in a place known to all the world can charge the tide. California is that place. California will show the way!"

"PERTINENT COMMENT ON MATTERS OF INTEREST" is a feature column in the *Labor Herald* of Wilmington, Del., conducted by the son of Al Saylor founder of the paper and a convinced Henry George man. He writes every week and does not neglect the land question. He says in the issue of Sept. 21: "It is possible to have a great national domain without grabbing land in some backward nation. We have it all about us."

A VERY fair article in the *Recorder* of San Francisco is headed "Another Year Will Say Whether Henry George Has Come to Life." *The Recorder* contains in another column an account from the *New York Times* of the ceremony at the grave of Henry George during the recent Henry George Congress in this city. *The Recorder* heads this "The Single Tax is Very Much With Us."

IT is good news that the recent Liberal victory in Canada gave a majority of 100 in a house of 245.

EDWIN I. S. HARDING of Toowong, Queensland, Australia, writes: "It is enough to make the angels laugh through their tears to see Abyssinians and Italians killing each other for land in a territory big enough to lose both armies in a war in which the rank and file have nothing to gain."

E. W. DOTY of Cleveland, in almost the last letter he wrote less than two months ago: "Your stuff this month is your best output."

WE have received a very interesting leaflet entitled "Equity—Equal Rights to All," from Mr. Frank Berman of this city. In a general way the leaflet is to be recommended. We would however call attention to his contention regarding the abolition of land titles which is not in accord with Henry George and would after all serve no useful purpose. With the socialization of economic rent it is both permissible and desirable that titles to land remain as at present, or until some better form of giving security of improvements is devised.

MRS. BENJAMIN W. BURGER having expressed her admiration for Mr. Dorn as Director of the Henry George School, saying he was the right man in the right place, her son, young Henry George Burger, spoke up and said: "Of course he was endorsed and recognized from the first, for was he not named O. K. Dorn." Quite a bright boy is young Henry.

ROBERT J. WILLIAMSON of Brooklyn, N. Y., passed away on Sept. 21. He was a veteran of the 1886 campaign and organized the West Side Henry George Club. He was also a member of the Manhattan Single Tax Club. He was interested in the Single Tax colony at Fairhope, Ala., which he visited several times.

AN article well worth reading appears in the October *Scribners*, "King Cotton's Slaves" by C. T. Carpenter who has befriended and defended the cotton croppers. Mr. Carpenter has written a remarkable article involving much careful research. His conclusions appear to us entirely sound.

REV. HERBERT BIGELOW is elected to the City Council in Cincinnati by first-choice vote under the preferential system in operation there. The *Cincinnati Post* gives a long and interesting account of his life and activities.

DORIS KNAPP has a letter in the *St. Louis Star Times* entitled "Poser for Will Durant." It should give some food for thought to that eminent writer and lecturer.

AN interesting interview with Dan Beard appears in the *Nyack (N.Y.) Journal News* of Oct. 26. Mr. Beard says: "Abe Lincoln and



Henry George stood out as the greatest men I ever met. Only two men awed me in my lifetime and these were the two."

It used to be said that land should be free as air. This contention may some day have to be modified for it may be that air will soon be no longer free. The Van Nuys, California, *Tribune* tells us that:

F. R. Hinman and Nannie Hinman today have a suit in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in which they ask \$90,000 damages from the United Air Lines, for use of the air during the past four years.

The contention of the Hinmans is that they own the air above the property just as well as oil and minerals that may be found beneath it.

WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS of Toronto writes: "I have been a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM and previously to the *Single Tax Review* for many years. I feel that a constant perusal of its tenets has helped to guide my convictions through life. I realize that the editing of this wonderful publication must be a more or less thankless task, but it is vital to the promulgation of the truth."

ALFRED M. BINGHAM has a review of Albert Jay Nock's "Our Enemy the State" in *Commonsense* in which he says that "Mr. Nock's enthusiasm for Henry George leads him to ignore the fact that land has become a minor element in the means of production." We should like to know if land is no longer a source of wealth, what is? For God's sake, let us know what is the *major* element to which land is now subordinate, so we can be introduced to it. Mr. Bingham only thinks he is thinking.

IN LaFollette's *Progressive* appears an open letter to the editor from Elizabeth Young George of Cecilville, Calif., headed, "Georgeists Carry On," in which she urges the perusal of LAND AND FREEDOM and other Single Tax periodicals.

IN the *Harvard Hillside* for Oct. 12 appears a two-column article from the pen of Fiske Warren on "The Enclave of Tahanto," in Massachusetts. The article is very interesting and is a valuable contribution to the subject of enclaves to which Mr. Warren has devoted so much of his interest and activity. For the benefit of some of our readers it may be explained that the "enclaves" which Mr. Warren has established in many parts of the world are Single Tax colonies modeled on the Henry George system in so far as local and State laws will permit. These serve as working models and furnish interesting social experiments along the lines of our philosophy.

## World Georgeist Publications

*Aradi Kozlony*—Str. Consistorului 21, Arad, Roumania.  
*A Terra*—Caixa Postal 3064, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.  
*The Broom*—P. O. Box 747, San Diego, Calif., U. S. A.  
*Bodenreform*—Lessingstrasse 11, Berlin, N. W. 87, Germany.  
*The Bulletin*—7 St. Martin's Place, London, W. C. 2, England.  
*The Commonweal*—P. O. Box 1227, Wellington, New Zealand.  
*The Crusader*—Ophir, Oregon, U. S. A.  
*De Nieuwe Aarde*—Stoombootpad 183, Amsterdam, Holland.  
*Det Frie Blad*—Store Kongensgade 60, Copenhagen, K, Denmark.  
*Fairhope Courier*—Fairhope, Alabama, U. S. A.  
*The Forum*—1325 E. Poplar Street, Stockton, Calif., U. S. A.  
*Grundskyld*—Monradsvej. 15, Copenhagen, Denmark.  
*Henry George Fellowship News*—7 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill., U. S. A.  
*Justice and Freedom*—care of Mr. E. F. Lane, J. P., Tullibigeal, N. S. Wales, Australia.  
*LAND AND FREEDOM*—150 Nassau Street, New York City, U. S. A.  
*The Liberator*—Kolamunda, Perth, West Australia.  
*The Liberator*—101 Victoria Arcade, Auckland, New Zealand.  
*No Taxes*—1325 E. Poplar Street, Stockton, Calif., U. S. A.  
*O Georgeista*—Caixa Postal 514, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

*People's Advocate*—George Parade, 11 Carrington Street, Adelaide, Australia.

*The Porcupine*—69 Piccadilly, Manchester, England.

*Progress*—18 George Parade, Melbourne, Australia.

*Recht En Vrijheid*—Princessweg 77, Groningen, Holland.

*La Reforma Social*—Velazquez 98, Madrid, Spain.

*Restats Bladet*—Munkegade 3. Aarhus, Denmark.

*Social Wealth*—48 St. George's Terrace, Perth, West Australia.

*The Standard*—114 Hunter Street, Australia.

*Tax Facts*—333 N. Madison Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif., U. S. A.

*Terre Et Liberte*—29 Boulevard Bourdon, Paris 1Ve, France.

*Land and Liberty*—94 Petty France, London, S. W. 1. England.

STATEMENT of the Ownership, Management, Circulation, etc., required by the Act of Congress of March 3, 1933, of LAND AND FREEDOM, published bi-monthly at New York, N. Y., for October, 1935.

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

Before me, a notary in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Joseph Dana Miller, who, having been duly sworn, according to law, deposes and says that he is the Editor of LAND AND FREEDOM and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in Section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

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

Publisher: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

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

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

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

2. That the owners are: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., Herman G. Loew, Pres., George R. Macey, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, New York City. None but Joseph Dana Miller own one per cent. or more of stock.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stocks, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER,

EDITOR.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 23d day of September, 1935.  
 [Seal] MORRIS ROSENZWEIG, Notary Public.

Bronx County.



# YOU CAN HELP MAKE 100,000 GEORGEISTS

That's the goal—100,000 dyed-in-the-wool, thoroughly informed, properly recorded Georgeists. It can be done—with your help. We know now how it can be done by teaching "Progress and Poverty." Simple, isn't it? No elaborate schemes—just the simple procedure of getting a group together each week, for ten weeks, to discuss with you each chapter of this great book. At the end of that short period every student becomes a real enthusiast. It has been proven.

## Start a Class Now

It's easy—and interesting. Call up a few friends and tell them that on, let's say, next Monday night, at 8 p.m. you are starting a class in Fundamental Economics—so that they can know the real cause of poverty, the real cure for depressions. Tell them to bring their friends. At your home, your office, in a public building—anywhere. All you need is a "Teacher's Manual"—a wonderful book giving suggestions on how to run a class, questions and answers covering every chapter in "Progress and Poverty." The "Manual" costs you One Dollar—and that's all the expense involved.

## Free Class Room Helps

The School will furnish you free the following, which you will find helpful in conducting your class.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Enrollment and Attendance Cards.                   | 6. Book - Marks (with definitions).                  |
| 2. Triple-Postcard Announcements. (Write for sample). | 7. Lesson Assignments for Distribution to Students.  |
| 3. Posters.   | 8. Graduation Certificates.                          |
| 4. Class Enrollment Sheet.                            | 9. Charter of Henry George School of Social Science. |
| 5. Questionnaires—for creating interest.              |  |

## Don't Delay -- Do It Now

You know what's wrong with the world today. You owe it to yourself, to your country, to start teaching—NOW.

FOR FURTHER DETAILS WRITE

## Henry George School of Social Science

CHARTERED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

211 WEST 79TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

For your business friends who need to know about  
land value taxation

## SAFEGUARD PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL

This little book shows how productive industry is crushed between the upper millstone of high taxes and the lower millstone of ground rent,—and the only way in which business can possibly find relief. Don't argue with your business friend. Give him a copy.

"Will be read by many who have not the intellectual capacity, nor perhaps the leisure, to examine what Henry George really taught." —Joseph Dana Miller, in LAND AND FREEDOM.

"A sensible suggestion at a time when big business and small business as well is crying for relief from heavy taxation. . . . Seems to fit the picture of what industry needs today."—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

"Non-technical and should interest anyone who is concerned with reducing taxes on industry."—*New York Investment News*.

The book is by LOUIS WALLIS, author of "The Struggle for Justice" and other volumes dealing with economic forces in world history.

All booksellers, 75 cents

DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & CO.

Garden City, Long Island, N. Y.

## What to Emphasize in Teaching the Georgeist Philosophy

Mr. Burger's great address at the recent

## Henry George Conference

in New York City, which appears in this issue, will be reprinted as a pamphlet if sufficient orders are received by the editor.

Send 10 cents a copy with orders for ten or more copies.

LAND AND FREEDOM

150 NASSAU STREET

NEW YORK CITY















