

September—October, 1935

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Henry George Congress

September 26 - 27 - 28

What Are We Going To Do About It?

Frank Chodorov

The Story of Tax Relief for Land

Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown

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.

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 5 WHOLE No. 192

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.....The Editor	139
WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?..Frank Chodorov	144
THE SINGLE TAX.....Henry George	148
A STORY OF TAX RELIEF FOR LANDHarry Gunnison Brown	150
HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS. SEPT. 26, 27 and 28.....	156
ADDRESS ON WORK OF THE SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION.....Antoinette Kaufmann	161
LETTER OF LORD SNOWDEN.....	163
EXTENSION CLASSES OF HENRY GEORGE SCHOOLJohn Lawrence Monroe	164
CONGRESS NOTES.....	165
THE IMPORTANCE OF FREE TRADE. ADDRESS AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS.....Stephen Bell	166
CONTEMPLATING THE HERE AND NOW...F. J. Eddy	168
WHAT THEY ARE SAYING.....	169
BOOK REVIEW AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED.....	171
CORRESPONDENCE.....	172
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	173

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

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

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

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

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

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

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXV

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1935

No. 5

Comment and Reflection

AMONG the explanations of the cause of the depression one that recurs most frequently is the World War. It is heard in speeches in Congress, in editorials, and often in the more thoughtful dissertations of prominent writers. Thus Mr. J. G. Lockhart in a recent work entitled "The Peace Makers," says: "The world did not fully recover from the Napoleonic Wars until a full generation had passed and the middle of the nineteenth century had been reached," and then he follows with the lesson from analogy that "we may not expect full recovery until about the year 1954."

JUST how wars work to produce depressions we are not informed, nor is any effort made to clear up the matter, beyond the remark casually let drop by Mr. Lockhart that "war is an expensive process." An analogy that seems to have been completely forgotten is the prosperity that followed our own Civil War, which would seem to require some counter explanation. The theory falls to the ground the moment it is examined.

FOR one thing, such explanation is too easy. We are, as a matter of fact, living in a constant depression—low wages, industrial insecurity and mass poverty. These are accentuated by periods of more acute distress which go under the name of "depressions." The times that we are out of these depressions are infrequent enough and to call them periods of prosperity is an abuse of language. With the masses of men there are always depressions. There are no times of prosperity—there are only times of less acute distress, less wide-spread poverty.

ARE such theories conscious attempts to evade inevitable conclusions following a closer analysis? We think not. They are born of a superficial analysis of the social problem, and an ignorance of economic factors. That escape out of the depression must wait until 1954, that not until then may we overcome the disastrous effect of a war that ended in 1918, will seem fantastic on reflection. For however great was the destruction of wealth resulting from the World War, a period of ten years would have more than sufficed for the replacement of that loss.

WHAT these theories naively ignore, are of course the economic factors. The very instant the flags are furled and peace declared, these economic factors, rudely interrupted by the chaos of conflict, begin their work. Mr. Lockhart writes as follows: "History, if we omit the rare and incalculable interference of the abnormal, is the product not of a few spectacular actions, but of innumerable events, unnoticed but irresistible in cumulations."

THE problem is incorrectly stated. History is not governed by the "interference of the abnormal," nor yet by "innumerable events," but by law, among which is the working of economic factors. These "innumerable events" are not the cause of social dislocations, but are the effect of the ignoring of natural laws. Wars themselves are the effects. What we amusingly call peace are only wars disguised. Nations that arm themselves with hostile tariffs are not only preparing for war—actually they are at war. And their conflicts of diplomacy are but one remove from armed conflict.

AFTER war, as after the World War, to which is erroneously attributed the depression, economic trends are once again in full swing. The same old round is to be traversed again. The same old stumbling blocks to progress remain. The same slow impoverishment of the workers that results from the taking of private wealth for public purposes and the gradual encroachment of speculative rent, paralyzing labor and capital, go on as before. These forces are at all times sufficient to account for the stagnation of industry without recourse to imaginary theories to account for periods of depression which differ from the normal only in intensity. The phenomena we observe, low wages, poverty, unemployment are the resultants of a denial of the natural order and not of the merely temporary dislocations caused by wars from which we soon recover, going from the horrors of war into the horrors of peace, which are only a little less devastating.

IT is safer as a mode of reasoning leading to sound conclusions, to consider economic theories in accordance with the economic facts, or in other words using the factors that belong to that special domain. If what

we know as economic laws work the same under the same conditions; if we deny men's right to the use of the earth; if, recognizing trade as a part of production, we nevertheless strangle trade by tariffs and taxes, we have a sufficient explanation of poverty and human misery without the resort to any other theory to account for what we see. Yet the proneness to consider theories of economic facts while ignoring economic factors is responsible for much unreason. We shall never get far until we look upon political economy as a science and consider it in the terms that belong to it.

THESE terms and relations are simple enough. Nothing indeed can be simpler. If land is a place to get things out of that we know by the name of wealth, and the earth is the only reservoir of human needs, by what natural law do we pay others for the permission of access to it? What is property? What is wealth? What are wages? Correct answers to these questions comprise all that need be known as political economy. All that is needed now is not to write books about it unless it is for the purpose of clearing away cobwebs. Henry George has written it in a great book which only an insane man would hope to improve upon, and in writing this book he has probably condemned a million other books, written or to be written, to a merited oblivion.

WE can never cease to be amazed at the difficulty men and women find in the comprehension of natural laws. It would seem they are about the last things they recognize—certainly the last things they are able to reason about. Yet the failure to apprehend them lies at the basis of nearly all our troubles. That the relations of men are subject to mechanical devices is the fundamental error of the Socialists. It is also at the basis of the Roosevelt fallacies, now in partial eclipse. The laws of cooperation and competition work such wonders when left to themselves that it would seem they could not be wholly overlooked. The need of reconciling human relations to these laws would seem to be obvious enough. But so little are men willing to trust these laws that *laissez faire* has come to be regarded as a horned beast. The industrial body must be treated to potions and plasters and the natural powers of recovery are never called into play. Even medicine has made more advances than that.

IT is quite impossible to catalogue the various explanations and remedies offered for the depression. Some of the "remedies" are incredibly silly because the diagnosis is almost invariably at fault. We have examined the war theory, but what shall be said of another rather numerous group who look to wars as the source of prosperity, thus reversing the theory that wars are responsible

for depressions. The technocrats have had their day and have faded out of the picture. Overpopulation and overproduction have done some service. There still lingers the notion, no less vague and indistinct than a host of others, that the machine age is responsible for the times through which we are passing, and that really nothing can be done about it unless we accept government ownership of the means of production.

JUST when the "machine age" began there seems to be some uncertainty. But considered rationally it must have had a beginning. The substitution of a spade for a stick in digging potatoes seems like the commencement of the so-called "machine age," but we cannot be quite certain of that. The substitution of the sewing machine for the needle might set a definite beginning for the machine age, but again we cannot be too sure. For the needle is a kind of machine. Anything that fortifies the hand, or substitutes mechanical appliance for physical labor, or adds to it, is a machine, and the process of such substitution is as old as the cave man, or older. When men talk of a machine age they are talking of civilization and processes coeval with the appearance of man on the planet. If the relation of man to land is understood there is no problem here. Every invention, every advance in the processes of production under normal relations, with free access to land, increases the opportunities for the production of wealth.

IT is the closing of natural resources, the blackmail laid upon industry by those who contribute nothing to industry, the ever increasing tribute demanded of labor and capital, that bedevils the process and leads the intellect astray. Once the factors in this very simple problem are understood it becomes no longer complicated. It is no longer a money question. It is no longer something that calls for planning—the plan is already made. It is no longer a question of too many people in the world—nature saw to that when the world was created. It is no longer a question of overproduction—too many good things for too many people in the world, a mathematical contradiction which we hear from the same lips. All these strange absurdities prevail and would require the pen of a Dean Swift to fitly characterize.

WE hear it said that "our industrial system has broken down." In one sense it has—in another and more important sense it has not. It is not necessary to rebuild the industrial system. Let us leave that to our ingenious friends, the Socialists, and their brothers, the social planners at Washington. If they would but recognize that what appears to be the breakdown of the system is not due to any inherent defects in the system itself, but to a *dislocation of the factors*. These factors

have been ignored—their proper functioning in the industrial system misapplied. There is nothing the matter with the system itself if these functions are recognized for what they are, and the office they fill and the work they do, properly apportioned. The industrial system has apparently broken down because the factors have not been recognized for what they are by those whose duty it is to teach, the statesmen and politicians, and the heads of our institutions of learning from which only occasionally a lucid voice is forthcoming.

THE notion that we need a central regulating power over industry explains the opposition to the Constitution and its interpretation by the Supreme Court in the recent N.R.A. decision. Paul Blanchard in a recent number of *The Forum* complains that the Constitution hampers progress because "it prevents a central control of our economic life and a unified system of labor laws." For our part we would be quite as distrustful of unified control of our economic life by politicians temporarily in power as in the hands of the nine able gentlemen who constitute the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, the Constitution is more flexible than "unified control" in the hands of a strong administration. It has been amended twenty-one times in 150 years. It is far from being a static instrument since it provides for its own modification by direct amendment. And we were told years ago by Peter Finley Dunne, somewhat cynically, that decisions of the Supreme Court "follow the election returns." So we may rest in that assurance if all else fails us.

BUT the very centralized powers for which Mr. Blanchard contends are a danger more imminent and perilous than any possible usurpation of power by the Supreme Court. We would not lightly ignore certain considerations, but some thoughtful men are saying that a dictatorship has been averted by the Supreme Court decision. We will not go so far as to assert this, but certain recent developments in the process of vesting in the Executive unusual powers have held a menace which it were wise not to underestimate.

NO doubt the power of forty-eight states to legislate in their own way on all matters which are not interstate opposes an obstacle to "unified control of labor," and we for one are glad of it. We would rather bear the possible inconveniences, if there are any, in favor of the forty-eight experiment stations in the legislatures of forty-eight states. It seems to us that democracy has a better fighting chance. We are glad that the Supreme Court stands as a guardian over the rights of the states. We have forty-eight times more faith in the emulative example of half a hundred legislatures competing for adventure in social progress than

a centralized government at Washington, however sloppily benevolent.

WE have made some progress in economic thought. No complaint that unemployment arises from laziness or improvidence is likely to be heard again. Nor is it probable that any great paper like the *Chicago Tribune* will again advance the giving of arsenic to the unemployed, the tramp or the striker. Strikes have become almost popular and unemployment too familiar a phenomenon. No future president of a great railroad system will advocate that strikers crying for food should be given "rifle diet and see how they like that kind of food." No, newspapers and railroad officials have grown if not more humane at least more cautious. So much has been gained for the cause of sanity and a calmer outlook upon the social problem.

HOW little we can depend on the teachings of so-called radical journals like *The Nation* is shown by their attitude toward the Supreme Court decision. *The Nation* says: "The President cannot complain about his luck. The Supreme Court has given him a new chance to assert his leadership after he himself has forfeited many golden opportunities. We think that he now has the best issue of his career." If *The Nation* really understood the economic issues involved it would hail the Supreme Court decision on the N.R.A. as a great step in the preservation of our liberties. We have no grave objection to amending the Constitution in a way that will restrict its power over national legislation. But that merely looks to a possible improvement of the instrument itself, and the Constitution provides the method of procedure. It is unfortunate that the issue should be presented at this time when the decision is in accordance with the best traditions of a liberty-loving people.

IF there is need for an amendment to the Constitution it is a pity that the chief protagonists of such change should be those who have shown small comprehension of American traditions. We should far rather trust the future of this republic with the men composing the Supreme Court than with Franklin Delano Roosevelt and those comprising the milk and water socialistic school of *The Nation* and *The New Republic*. There is, we believe, little to choose between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Villard. Neither school to which these men belong has the faintest conception of natural law in wealth distribution, and both seem to think that laissez faire and the operation of free competition disastrous in their results. Neither school has the faintest conception of human liberty. *The Nation* has done some good service on occasions for the defense of human rights, but what man's fundamental rights are is left to conjecture.

LET *The Nation* speak for itself. In one article entitled "A Constitutional Plutocracy," it says: "Our mutual life is dominated by agriculture and commerce. Unless they can be controlled by the nation the government of the country virtually passes to them." We say now that this is un-American doctrine. It is bad economics; it is Socialism half disguised. They are words if they mean anything that lead straight to Karl Marx. No wonder the Supreme Court decision irritates men who believe as they do in federal control of all means of earning a livelihood. The control of economic factors by forty-eight states is not enough. Statute law and the civil law we are told are not sufficient to guard against abuses. So the federal power must be asked to step in and work its wonders.

The Nation writer continues: "How can the situation be met? Met it must be, for without action we are confirmed as the serfs of big business." This is the sheerest kind of nonsense. In this instance the Supreme Court stands for sound economics and American liberty. The bigness of big business is a negligible factor. *The abolition of monopoly is all that is demanded*, but *The Nation* is not willing to take this step. It prefers to fight the Supreme Court decision when such decision is a victory for the principles of American liberty which we have cherished for 150 years and to which *The Nation* now and then has contributed some lip service.

REMEMBER now that in all of this Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard proposes no reform in the process by which we are (to quote) "handed over to the mercies of a business and fundamental plutocracy." Did indeed the Supreme Court decision do this to us? If so it is really imperative that something be done about it. Why these strictures against the Constitution and the Supreme Court and not against the powers to which we are now "handed over, bound hand and foot?" Will this kind of dreary nonsense find disciples? Is the answer that if Henry Ford's plant is now too big it should be made smaller, and by federal enactment? That big farms be split up into smaller farms? If the objection is to big business may we not ask, "How big?" Nothing here about monopoly that operates against both big and little businesses. Nothing against federal meddling and taxes that choke little businesses as well as big. Nothing to show that the earth is closed against industry, that men are denied a place to work, that capital and labor, big and little businesses, are crushed by the exactions of land monopoly.

IT seems to be the opinion of *The Nation* that everybody not opposed to the Supreme Court decision is committed to the status quo. If to reject the status quo means the acceptance of "production for use rather than

profit," which is a fundamental tenet in *The Nation's* Socialism—we are indeed committed to the rejection of all such nonsense. For is not all production for use, and is not profit the incentive and the real wages of production?

IN making his fight against the Supreme Court, if President Roosevelt should deem this essential for his reelection, he will have with him the forces of organized labor. There is little hope here for any real effort to get at the root of the matter. We shall hear nothing of fundamental economics, of course. These will be carefully kept in the background. The leaders of the A. F. of L. are for the most part politicians who will strive only to retain their power. The fight is none of ours though we may well remind both principals to the controversy that wages and hours of labor are not something in the power of any tribunal to regulate. They will learn this some day when they cease their shadow boxing. They will no longer serve as pawns in the game, whether played by politicians of the stamp of Hoover or Roosevelt.

THE condition of the tenants of the State of Georgia, once called, because of its greater enterprise, "The Yankee land of the South," is described as deplorable. The State can no longer be singled out from portions of the less progressive South. At least this is true of a part of Georgia. The landlords have seen to it that the land which yields abundance, which despite the fact that if the farmer can get a piece of land to work he can live comfortably all his life, the opportunity is closed against him.

HERE is such an obvious lesson that it seems impossible it can be ignored much longer. The impudence of a certain section of Georgia landlords passes all comprehension. One is reported to have said: "If a tenant makes a living he ought to be satisfied instead of trying to make more. When they come and tell me they are not making enough I tell them to get off my land and stay off." No wonder Erskine Caldwell, who has contributed a series of papers to the *New York Evening Post*, says: "The landowner-tenant system will have to go. No act of its own is motivated by any desire save that of profit at the expense of the physical, moral and economic welfare of the workers." This is the condition that is transforming the Yankee Land of the South into a veritable hell on earth for Whites and Blacks who are of the disinherited landless.

AT last we have found an appropriate name for the men in control of affairs at Washington. There is a type of antelope at the Central Park Zoo called aoudads which race around in circles. Recently when the eclipse

of the moon occurred they accentuated their speed along a circular course, though the aoudads are likely to run around in circles with no excuse whatever. The same is true of the Washington species. No eclipse of the moon or sun frightens them really; the eclipse of industry only sets them to work with pen and paper figuring how if they had been in charge of the matter there would have been no eclipse.

CONTESTANTS for the Big Award are pressing one another very closely now. The reader will ask, "What award?" It is the award that awaits the one who suggests the most original remedy for poverty and depressions. Out first choice is Roger Babson. Most of us will remember the remedy suggested by Dean Swift for Ireland's troubles, which was the killing of all new born babies. The "gloomy Dean" was not as serious as Mr. Babson appears to be, nor as thorough. But let the Sage of Babson Park speak for himself. He says, advocating birth control for families on relief: "The very fact that a family is on relief shows that too many of that group exist. (sic). Hence I would use every decent means of reducing the number until the group no longer needed relief. That is just ordinary common sense." Then he adds with a self-satisfied air: "The whole question of relieving unemployment is so simple that I cannot understand why any one will permit religious or other prejudices to block the situation."

THE whole question may be simple indeed but Mr. Babson has not come within miles of solving it. He further elaborates his plan, which includes the "drafting of workers into industry on the same principles that men were drafted out of industry during the World War. Every employer should add to his payroll one or more persons from each family in distress, and should not be allowed to discharge any on the payroll without the consent of some impartial board like the draft boards."

IT is significant of current confusion that suggestions like the above receive attention in the public prints. Mr. Babson evidently thinks that there are such persons as "employers of labor" who pay wages regardless of the demand for the product. How glad they would be to be able to take on one or more employees! Mr. Babson has been an unsparing critic of the New Deal but he is even more at sea than the supporters of that strange policy. We think Mr. Babson qualifies for the Big Award. We cannot imagine any profounder nonsense.

MR. WALTER LIPPMAN is little better in his reasoning than Roger Babson, though he is more suave and a little less ignorant. In one of his articles in the *Herald-Tribune* he says, speaking of the planning programme: "There are of course many who think that artificial measures are never warranted. They may

be right, though I think that our situation in 1933 called for them. But in public affairs, as in medicine, the resort to artificial stimulants, even when it is necessary, is dangerous and habit-forming. The good doctor and the good statesman are those who know how big a dose of stimulants is necessary, and, above all, when to stop giving them."

REASONING by analogy is always dangerous and especially so in this illustration. The economic man does not need stimulants but a restoration of the natural functioning. Every good physician ministering to his patient considers this first. The economic man is bound hand and foot with tariffs, taxes and monopolistic exactions. His normal functions are interfered with. He is a mighty poor physician who in such a crisis recommends stimulants rather than freeing the patient who is being choked to death. Why not try the experiment of unbinding him?

WE think Mr. Lippman has a vague consciousness of this. We instance, "They may be right," followed by the phrase, "even when necessary." This is a deliberate begging of the question for if those opposing artificial stimulants "may be right" the necessity vanishes along with the rest of the argument. That is a kind of careless writing which is habitual with Mr. Lippman and does much to destroy our faith in the soundness of his reasoning.

IN the *Atlantic* for August is an article by Abraham Flexner on Private Fortunes and the Public Future, in which is given a list of the most notable benefactions in the establishment of hospitals, colleges, etc. Were we inclined to be captious we might question the title "Private Fortunes," since all fortunes are private. There is only one *public* fortune, the economic rent of land—all other fortunes are private. Mr. Flexner seems to think that there is need of some agency or power "to check greed or folly." We may remind Mr. Flexner of Herbert Spencer's statement that the only result of laws designed to protect fools against the consequences of their folly has been to fill the world with fools. But a far more important consideration is that the great fortunes out of which these benefactions have come are for the most part the accumulated loot of privilege and monopoly, and, to an overwhelming extent, the privilege of land monopoly. Had these enormous fortunes been allowed to remain in the hands of the people where they belong, communities would have built more magnificent hospitals and more extensive colleges than any we see today as the result of private benefactions. Mr. Flexner has a few flings at the laissez faire doctrine, which seems to be the habit just now of those who do not understand what it is all about.

HOW plausible seem these attacks on the laissez faire principle which Mr. Flexner tells us is "forever closed." Yet when was it open? Free competition against which superficial writers fulminate, has never existed in the world. Monopoly of the natural resources has everywhere interfered with the normal law of competition, and thus against the law of cooperation, which is its complement and not its opposite. With government monopolies everywhere, how idle it is to attribute the ills of society to the exactly opposite policy!

AND speaking of "private fortunes" reminds us of the "share the wealth" slogan heard so frequently nowadays. But whose wealth? Granted that what is needed is a more equitable distribution, is there no ethical discrimination to be observed? Are we to ignore the origin of these fortunes which we propose so lightly to share among us? What right have we to them—how much greater right than the present possessors?

DICK TURPIN had a political economy like that. It made him quite popular for a time, but looking at him in retrospect his code of morals does not seem quite so inviting? Of course, his practices included one of the cardinal principles of Mr. Lippman and other thinkers when discussing taxation without any consideration at all of "the benefits received" theory. Of course, too, there are times when Dick Turpin's somewhat reprehensible conduct seems lily-white when compared to the practices of governments. Turpin seems a somewhat gallant figure when compared with the sneaking practices of our official representatives and their greedy snarls. "Share the wealth," indeed! That has been the cry of every highwayman and brigand from Robin Hood to Dillinger.

IT is impossible to imagine a greater robber than the government itself. It has "shared the wealth" with a vengeance. Every purchaser of a twenty cent article in many states is robbed of a part of his purchase. Even the mother who buys milk for her babes is robbed in New Jersey, so that the receiver of economic rent (the only public wealth) may escape his contribution to the cost of government which itself creates these values. Dick Turpin would not have done that!

THE great robbery of which these lesser robberies are but the sequels and consequences is the robbery of the earth. Against this robbery the great minds of all the ages have protested, Moses, Gregory the Great, Tom Paine, Carlyle, Rousseau, Tolstoy, Henry George and many others. Only the last offered a definite solution. But the robbery continues. With the earth closed, or open only on the terms of the lords of the earth, unem-

ployment, poverty and misery result. They are the ev results of the system which denies man a place to wor Not only is this a challenge to labor, it is equally a cha lenge to capital. It is time that capital and labor awok These stupid, snarling cries of "share the wealth" shou be a warning to capital, to the possessors of wealth, ar to labor. The remedy is theirs if they will but take i To the wealthy, the conservation of their fortunes, th security of their possessions; to labor, the freedom work—these call for the application of the only remed that is safe, sane and easily brought about. Publ wealth for public purposes, private wealth as the sacre property of those who create it. And all this to l effected by the mere shifting of the tax burden. Is not worth trying?

"What Are We Going to Do About It?"

WHEN the complete panorama of human justic reveals itself to the student of "Progress ar Poverty," he asks with an impetuosity born of knowled and conviction:

"What are we going to do about it?"

That question has confronted every teacher of Henr George. It is a question which bespeaks not only a understanding of the fundamental economics on whic the proposal to socialize ground rent is based, but als an earnest desire to see this reform enacted into law that involuntary poverty, that scourge of humanit shall be abolished from this earth. The riddle of th Sphinx has been solved. Why wait?

In attempting to answer that question every teach reaches back into memory for a satisfying reply. H thinks of the time when he, too, having closed the grea book with that ecstatic feeling that comes to one to whos a great truth has been revealed, asked the same que tion. He recalls the many plans and campaigns, th speeches made, the pamphlets written and distributed the congresses held and the resolutions passed—every thing that has been done "about it" since the time of Henry George. He finds no adequate answer, becaus he knows that every plan attempted has fallen far shor of the goal. He realizes that this failure to advance cause so grounded in reason and justice has not been du to any fallacy in its logic, nor yet to lack of ability or self-sacrifice on the part of many who have devoted the lives to it. The reason that the Single Tax reform ha not advanced must be due to lack of public demand fo it, which in turn must be ascribed to lack of publ knowledge of it.

The late Oscar Geiger, founder of the Henry Georg School of Social Science, realized that widespread educ tion must be a prerequisite for any successful attemp to enact Single Tax legislation. He arrived at this cor

usion only after many years of active work in various single Tax endeavors. He was the kind of devotee who never failed to lend a helping hand in any effort to advance the cause. Yet, some years before he passed on he realized that this sporadic expounding of Henry George's philosophy could only arouse interest in a few listeners, and that complete conviction could come only with thorough knowledge. And he further realized that the short-cuts of political action in which he had taken so active a part did not succeed because there had not been a sufficient background of education.

WE MUST EDUCATE

But why, it may be asked, is education so necessary to this movement? Many reform movements have been attempted, and some successfully brought about, with mere propaganda—speeches and literature. The Abolitionists of the middle of last century, and the Prohibitionists at the beginning of this one, both saw their proposals put into law without any educational campaign, depending entirely upon propaganda literature and extensive speech-making. The reason for this is that they had nothing to teach. Their reforms were based entirely upon sentiment. It is a far cry from "Uncle Tom's Cabin" to "Progress and Poverty." And then emagoguery has a quicker appeal than reason.

Why, then, cannot the Single Tax be advocated in the same way? Surely, we can appeal to the hearts of men with our proposal to abolish poverty, with all the social readjustments that arise from it. The very beauty of "Progress and Poverty" is in its ethical approach to economics. The desire to destroy the cruel system of landlordism that is gnawing at the vitals of civilization is a human impulse, not confined to the erudite. And so on.

Quite true. But it so happens that in order for us to reach the hearts of men we must dislodge from their minds certain erroneous conceptions which have been accepted as true and necessary for many centuries. The iniquity of landlordism is apparent only to those who have some idea of the function of economic rent. The populace looks upon landlordism not as a necessary evil, but as a beneficial system. A tax on land values is to the average citizen no different in effect from a tax on labor products; and the farmer, even the tenant farmer, is quite sure we Single Taxers (if he has ever heard of us) want to "take his land away from him." When we speak of wealth as one thing, and of land, money and bonds as another thing, we are running contrary not only to what seems obvious to the man in the street, but also to what he has been taught to believe since the beginning of time. Nay, we are speaking a language that is foreign even to the student of "economics" in our universities. To him our differentiation between land and capital is as ungrounded as it is bewildering.

Our problem is, therefore, primarily educational. It

would be foolhardy to venture an opinion as to just how the Single Tax will be written into our statute books. That eventually we must enter the political arena with our proposal is quite evident; for we ask for a change in our fiscal laws, and that can only be brought about by a counting of ballots. Whether we shall gain our end by separate party action, or through referenda or initiative petitions, it is almost useless to speculate. What the precedent political conditions will be is also speculative. Some there are who claim that a social upheaval, even communism, will precede the Single Tax, and it is plausible to assume that a land value tax will be part of a general reform movement which will include many things foreign and antagonistic to our philosophy. In any event, it is certain that no matter what form of political action we engage in, or what political situation arises that will make possible the enactment of land value taxation, the extent of our influence or success will depend on the number of citizens who are thoroughly familiar with the philosophy of Henry George. Even if through some subterfuge or freakish political situation we should be able to have the Single Tax written into the fundamental law of a political subdivision of the country it is questionable whether the result would be desirable; for, without the intelligent vigilance of a reasonable number of informed citizens, the landlords could make such a law appear ineffective and even harmful, so that our reform would seem to be a "failure," would be discredited, and would be retarded for many years, perhaps centuries. The price of liberty is intelligent, no less than eternal, vigilance.

But, though only through widespread education can we hope to inaugurate and maintain our reform, it must not be assumed that our problem is to teach "Progress and Poverty" to fifty-one per cent of the people. That would be an impossible task. It is a fact that an organized minority that knows what it wants can dominate a large crowd; but the minority must be of sufficient size to make its voice heard. Neither the Abolitionists nor the Prohibitionists ever approached the proportions of a majority in their successful campaigns. Just how many Single Taxers we should have to assure permanent success is very difficult to say. It has been estimated that one hundred thousand is the number we need in this country. This is not an insuperable goal. In a comparatively few years, the concerted efforts of all those who now believe in our philosophy can achieve this result.

THE PLAN

The plan evolved by the trustees of the Henry George School of Social Science is as follows: To organize as quickly as possible One Thousand Classes in "Progress and Poverty" in various parts of the country, wherever teachers can be located. Experience has shown that between ten to twenty students make an ideal class.

The course is completed in ten weeks. Therefore, allowing for unforeseen delays and vocation periods, each teacher can complete three classes in a year, accounting for approximately forty graduates. Thus, forty thousand will have been added to our number in one year. It must be born in mind, however, that the increasing momentum of this campaign is a factor that makes any estimate of numbers impractical. Every graduate becomes a potential teacher, or at any rate a solicitor of students. Every class in a larger community becomes the nucleus for a full-time school. Among our students are many who come in contact with large groups in their daily work—such as school teachers, labor leaders, social workers, newspaper men. In proportion as we have more of this type of student the greater will be the acceleration of our campaign. Nor must it be forgotten that numbers attract attention, and that activity arrests public notice; as we progress in our educational work the public press, even where it is antagonistic, will aid in filling up our class rooms.

When a well-conceived and fundamentally sound plan is determined upon it is futile to attempt to foresee every eventuality and to outline every detail of procedure in advance. It is quite possible that educational avenues other than the class method will be available, such as the radio, correspondence courses, and the use of newspaper and magazine space. This will be dependent upon our financial resources, which, of course, will be enhanced with the increase in our numbers. Nor must we overlook the possibility of our own classes being augmented by classes in established educational institutions, for not only will our own teacher students carry the message of economic justice to their schools, but the increase in our numbers will compel the professional teachers of economics to at least explain Henry George's theory in their class rooms. Nay, the very problem of increasing poverty, the inadequacy of the nostrums that are being offered, the clamor for a real cure will force public interest to our fundamental reform as the increasing number of our graduates call attention to it. It is inevitable, also, that the impatience of Single Taxers with the slow and steady progress of education will result in attempting political action; while such action cannot possibly be successful at this time, or even in the immediate future, it cannot but be helpful to the school movement because of the very publicity which political action always attracts.

So, as we embark on this great educational venture, we cannot foresee what storms we shall encounter or what favorable winds will help us on our course. We know that our bark has a sound keel and that it will get us to our port if only we are steadfast in our purpose. Anchors aweigh. Let's go.

WHAT "I" MUST DO

For the individual who, having absorbed the full truth of "Progress and Poverty," asks himself, "What am I

going to do about it?" The answer must be found primarily in his own resources, his abilities and his limitations, his spiritual make-up. Genius should not, cannot, be harnessed. Men of strength and vision make their own plans. But, it is not amiss to suggest to every graduate some thoughts on how he can cooperate with the general campaign of the school, as well as some avenues of individual expression which will advance the cause.

First, and foremost, every believer in the philosophy of Henry George should appoint himself a committee of one to see that his school or class is never lacking in students. No matter what kind of propaganda work he engages in, the thought uppermost in his mind should be to persuade everyone he comes in contact with to study "Progress and Poverty." No Single Taxer is true to his principles who does not enroll at least five students a year. With that first item in our credo faithfully adhered to the educational campaign cannot possibly fail.

Secondly, he should try to increase the number of classes in his community. Small classes are most effective because they encourage discussion. Therefore, when a class numbers more than twenty, possibly fifteen is a better number, a new class should be formed. And in larger cities, where the inconvenience of travel is a consideration, it is desirable to organize classes in various parts of the town. Sometimes it is possible to persuade a group of friends to attend a class in some home, while it might be impossible to have them travel downtown to a classroom. Business and professional people can be induced to join a class of their own, meeting in a convenient office, while the thought of attending a school at their ages may seem puerile. Groups of serious minded women, their appetites for social gatherings somewhat jaded by the vacuity of their previous endeavors, can be appealed to on the ground of personal enlightenment and greater public service. Men's clubs and church groups offer opportunity for classes. Nor should we overlook adult educational schools, vocational schools, business colleges, giving them an opportunity to widen their scope by offering their students a course in fundamental economics.

Thirdly, every student of the Single Tax should prepare himself to teach. As the number of classes increases the demand for teachers will be a strain on our forces. It is of prime importance, therefore, that every follower of Henry George consider himself a possible teacher and be prepared to be called or to call himself into service. While it is true that many effective teachers have been men whose only acquaintance with our philosophy has been gained from a thorough understanding of "Progress and Poverty," it is always helpful if the teacher has studied all of George's books, especially the "Science of Political Economy" and "Protection or Free Trade." Such books as Professor Geiger's "Philosophy of Henry George," Louis F. Post's "Prophet of San Francisco," Patrick Dove's "Theory of Human Progression," and

others, all help to broaden the teacher's knowledge and thus enable him to bring to the class an erudition that is impressive, and a mental experience that enables him to cope with class-room questions. But, such wider study is only helpful, not necessary. Perhaps an ability to interpret political and economic affairs of the day in the light of Henry George's philosophy is more important, for the average class-room question is based on current events. The Henry George School of Social Science publishes a "Teachers' Manual," with questions, answers, and suggestions on how to conduct classes, that is an invaluable pedagogical help to every teacher. For purposes of uniformity the trustees of the Henry George School of Social Science require authorized teachers to use this manual as a guide.

Thus, the answer to "What am I going to do about it" is quite definite. First, get students; second, organize classes; third, be a teacher. If every follower of Henry George will follow this personal programme faithfully the success of the educational campaign is assured. And upon the success of this campaign depends the success of any political endeavor that the movement may eventually decide to engage in.

WHAT "I" MIGHT DO

To those who feel inclined to enlarge upon their personal activities, there is ever so much work that can be done. For the orator these are unbounded opportunities. In these days of stress, when the minds of men, oppressed by the ever-increasing problems of poverty, bewildered by the confusion of illogical nostrums that are offered for their solution, and faith in long-established concepts of government shaken by innovations which run contrary to reason, are open to any proposal which might appear to be more in harmony with logic and experience, the orator who can effectively demonstrate a natural order in our politico-economic life would indeed be given a hearing. There are ever so many audiences that are prepared to listen.

And while we are on this topic of platform-teaching of the Single Tax, there is a thought that should be considered by the organized groups in our movement. Speakers' bureaus should be established in every city for the purpose of conducting regular campaigns for securing opportunities to speak. It is easier for a secretary to "sell" the services of the orator than for the latter to solicit engagements for himself.

For those who are literarily inclined, for the research student, for those who can wield the pen effectively, there are limitless opportunities. Such work must perforce be purely personal in character; no organization can foster creative thinking.

The Single Tax movie scenario has not yet been written. Nor the novel that shall popularize the land question as "Uncle Tom's Cabin" popularized the slavery question. We need editorial writers who will apply the acid

test of Natural Law to the news events of the day. No one has yet written a book showing how landlordism and its corollary, restrictive tariffs, caused that crazy conflagration, "The World War." History needs to be re-written in the light of Henry George's philosophy.

In the field of economics we need a comparative study of all the schools, demonstrating their fallacies as well as their conflicting ideas, so as to further enhance the grandeur, simplicity and cogency of the system taught by Henry George. We need graphic charts, based upon factual findings, to determine the irrefutable deductions of Henry George. For instance, a chart showing how wages and interest rise as rent falls, and vice versa. Or, a chart showing the relation between the volume of charity dispensed in the city of New York and the rise in land value. The ratio of bankruptcies to increased land values, in number and in dollar volume; the increase of farm tenantry; the concentration of mineral land ownership and the consequent rise of monopolies; a comparison of land values and mortgages; land booms that preceded panics; one could go on almost indefinitely naming subject matter to which the research student could well apply himself in the effort to prove factually and by charts the effect of private land ownership on economic and social phenomena.

The legalistic and political aspects of land ownership open a wide field for the lawyer-authors in our movement. We really should have definite knowledge of the legal hurdles it will some day be necessary to overcome so that land valuation laws may stand the test of court action. The legal history of private land ownership would make interesting and intelligent material.

It is not necessary to speculate further into the fields of inquiry for subjects on which the student and the literary-minded could engage with profit. Enough has been indicated to show the vastness of the intellectual mine in which these minds can explore for more than one answer to the question, "What am I going to do about it."

IT'S UP TO YOU

The task is yours. It is not a question of "what are *we* going to do about it?" but "what am *I* going to do about it?" The problem is an individual one, and its solution is directly dependent upon, and in exact ratio to, the effort and ability of every one who has acquired a knowledge of Henry George to spread this knowledge. Do not wait for somebody else. Do not waste time in praying for a leader. "Progress and Poverty" is your guide, Henry George is your inspiration, and you are the disciple, on whom the mantle has fallen. Go forth into the highways and the by-ways and teach the gospel of economic liberty.—FRANK CHODOROV.

TO accommodate the report of the Congress and other matter which should find place, this issue comprises forty pages instead of the usual thirty-two.

The Single Tax*

By HENRY GEORGE

THE Single Tax is NOT a tax on land. It is a tax on land value—on that value which attaches to land irrespective of improvements in or on it; that value which remained in the land of Johnstown after every improvement had been hurled into awful heaps of debris; that value left in the business part of Lynn lately swept by fire; that value which remains in a centrally located city lot after the building on it has become of so little value that it is bought only to be torn down.

It may be said: "What is the use of making this distinction? You would not speak of taxing house values or ship values; but of taxing houses or ships. In the United States when we speak of taxing land we mean taxing it according to value. We do tax some things specifically, but land we usually tax by value." This is true. And it is worth noting. For it shows that instead of being a new tax, which would require a tremendous new taxing machine and a fundamental change in our government, the Single Tax is really a tax we now collect in the tax on real estate. All that is new in it is the SINGLE. The tax itself we already have. To make it the SINGLE tax we have only to abolish other taxes.

But as to the necessity for the distinction. There is a difference between taxing land and taxing land values that does not exist between taxing such things as ships and houses and taxing their values—a difference that, although of no importance in ordinary thought or speech, becomes all-important when we come to reason on the effects of taxation. A tax on house or ship values would fall on all houses or ships—or at least on all that have not been abandoned and are yet in use. But a tax on land values would not fall on all land, nor yet on all land in use, for value does not attach to all land, nor to all land in use.

A tax on land—that is to say, a specific tax on all land—WOULD become a condition to, and a restriction on, the use of land; WOULD hamper the use of the natural factor of production; WOULD fall on farmers; WOULD become a tax on labor; and WOULD increase prices by increasing the cost of production. These are valid objections to a tax on land. It is a tax on what in the terminology of political economy is styled rent—that value, namely, which, irrespective of the value of improvements, attaches to SOME land with the growth of population and social development; that premium which the user as user must pay to the owner as owner,

either in one payment (purchase money) or in annual payments (rent), for permission to use land of superior excellence.

The Single Tax, therefore, could NOT fall on all land. It could fall only on valuable land, or land of superior excellence. Hence it could not restrict production, or lessen the use of land, or diminish the earnings of labor or capital. It could only take the premium which the user as user must pay to the owner as owner; and since this would discourage speculation and make it easier to get land for use, it would tend to increase production and to increase the earnings of labor and capital.

In point of exchangeable power, or as items in the wealth of individuals, there is no difference between a given value of land and a like value of grain, metals, cattle, clothing, machinery, tools, or ships; but observation will show wide differences in their nature, their genesis, their laws, and their relations. As an example of the valuable things whose common character is that they are produced by labor, and which in political economy are alone properly classed as wealth, let us take a thing of the kind that in common thought and legal terminology comes closest to land—a building.

Here is a building which, irrespective of the land it stands on, is worth \$5,000; and here is a piece of land which, without any improvement in or on it, is also worth \$5,000. These values are equivalent, representing to the owner equal powers of obtaining other things in exchange. But—

The value of the building attached to it originally, from the moment it came into existence. The land had no original value. There is no building in the United States that did not have a value when first erected. But, though the land has existed for geologic ages, there is no land in the United States that has had any value for more than a few hundred years; while there is much land now valuable that has only had a value for a few years, or even for a few months.

The value of a building lessens with time, since with time buildings decay. And in growing and improving communities improvements that cheapen the cost of building, and changes in the kinds of buildings demanded, also tend to lessen the value of existing buildings. But land is not subject to decay or change of fashion. Nor can decrease in the cost of production lessen its value, for land is not produced by man, but was here before he came. So far from diminishing with time, the value of land in growing and improving communities tends steadily to increase. In all our growing cities there is no building that is worth as much as it was a year ago, but land as a rule is worth more.

In the case of the building, what determines value is the cost of producing such a building. In the case of land, it is its relative advantage for use over other land—the final element in which is its location in respect to population. The value of the building has thus indi-

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

vidual exertion as its basis. It represents the present value of labor embodied in the building. The value of land, on the other hand, has social growth as its basis. It does not represent the value of any individual exertion, but the present value of an appropriation—for the ownership of land cannot be obtained by producing, but only by appropriating what already exists. The labor of the individual exerted on land may produce value, but it will be a value inhering in the product or improvement the labor makes, not in the land itself. That value comes only by growth of population and social advance. A man may work or spend on land to any amount; but no matter how valuable his improvements, the land itself acquires no value except as the community around it grows and improves, or access to larger populations is opened. He may do nothing at all, and, as social growth and improvement go on, the value of his land will increase. He may be an absentee, an infant, an imbecile—social growth will still add value to his land.

Thus in taxing buildings or other products of labor we take from the individual what individual exertion produced, thus impairing the natural reward of exertion, and checking the springs of general wealth. But in taxing land values we take from the individual what is brought by social growth; we simply apply to the use of the community what non-producers would otherwise appropriate. In no wise do we lessen the rewards of exertion or check the springs of general wealth. On the contrary, in applying to public use the power of drawing on the general wealth which pertains to the ownership of land we discourage ownership without use, and thus prevent natural opportunities for production from being withheld from use.

Here it may be asked, as the Socialists ask, "Why should not the whole results of production be left to those who take part in production?"

The sufficient answer is, that there is no possible way of leaving to labor and capital that part of the product that constitutes economic rent. This setting aside, as it were, of a certain portion of the results of production which MAY be taken by the community, but otherwise WILL be taken by non-producers, is a result of advance in civilization. It arises from the necessity, which comes with the higher uses of land, of giving individual possession, and from differences in the capabilities of land. Even where the owner and the user of land are the same person, economic rent exists. Where the demand for wheat causes the cultivation of land that with a certain application of labor and capital will yield fourteen bushels an acre, the owning farmer whose land, otherwise equal, will yield to the same application twenty bushels will have an advantage—not as a cultivator, but as a land-owner. The power of getting six bushels more with the same exertion will inhere not in his labor nor in his capital, but in his land. He may cease to take any part in production and still get the equivalent of the six bushels

by renting the land; or if he does not choose to rent, or is prohibited from doing so, he can get from the user who takes his place an equivalent sum or obligation. So, if a site in the center of a city will enable a store-keeper to get a larger net profit than will one on the outskirts, a separable advantage will attach to this site, which he who has the right of use can rent or sell.

These advantages attach to land; they cannot go to labor or capital. Where they go to a laborer or a capitalist, they go to him not as laborer or capitalist, but as land-owner or possessor and give him an advantage above what his labor and capital can give. The whole product can go to labor—or to labor and capital, if they both engage in production—only where social development is so rude that no special advantage attaches to one location over another, and the land is treated as a common. In civilized societies, where there are great and increasing differences in the advantages of location, it is only on the poorest land in use that labor and capital can retain the full results of production. Any location where land has superior capability must command a premium which labor and capital must pay. This premium may be taken in taxation on land values for the use of the community, as we Single Tax men propose; or it may be left to land-owners, as for the most part it is now left. But it cannot go to labor and capital. There is no way of leaving it to them.

Let me illustrate: In newspaper offices where union rules prevail the price of composition is based on the average work, and steps are taken to secure to every workman his fair chance of "fat" and "lean." But it is sometimes desirable to permit special men to set particular kinds of "fat matter." In such cases those who set this matter pay a premium to the others by way of equalization. To abolish these premiums, and to allow the men who set the "fat" to retain the full amount of their bills, would not be to give them the wages of their labor, but to give them the advantages of monopoly. To put the theory of the Single Tax in terms every printer will understand, it is to take "department premiums" for the use of the "chapel."

Labor, capital, and land are the three factors of production, the first two being different forms of the human factor, the last being the natural factor. Labor and capital must have a reward for their exertion or they cannot continue to exert themselves, or, indeed, to exist. But Nature claims no reward. Land is her free gift to man, her gratuitous service. The primary division of the product is therefore between these two, or into wages and interest. And this (monopoly eliminated) continues to be the division on what in political economy is styled the margin of production, or the poorest land in use—land on which labor and capital can produce only their ordinary returns. But where labor and capital are willing to work on land of a certain quality—or, what is the same thing, can from their product on it

obtain the ordinary rate of wages and interest—then that law of competition that tends to bring wages and interest to a common level will enable the owner of land of superior quality to claim the excess which the exertion of labor and capital will yield on that, over what they could obtain on the poorer land. And as the earnings of labor and capital must always be fixed by what they can obtain on the poorest land worked, while the growth and development of society tends to bring out higher and higher capabilities in particular lands, the portion of the results of production that land-owners can claim tends constantly to increase with the advance of civilization.

It is this part of the increment of wealth—the part called by John Stuart Mill the “unearned increment,” because it now goes to, non-producers—that we propose by the Single Tax to take for public needs in place of the taxes now levied on industry, enterprise, and thrift.

Is not this clearly the wise and just way of raising public revenues?

(To be Continued)

Action!

IT seems unthinkable that any Henry-Georgian should object to organization and action. Suppose mistakes are made. They are inevitable, but in spite of our mistakes the right implement can only be found by trying and will be found at last, and the cause will triumph sooner than from a course in inactivity.

Are we to be raised to the seventh heaven every time we read a Georgist paper or book and then do nothing about it! It would seem that we have wasted enough steam in that way to have got somewhere long ago. But we are all playing the part of lone scouts with none of the enthusiasm of camaraderie. The exhilaration of belonging to a great national body would be of untold value to the cause.

The appeal from the Land League in your last issue came as a surprise to the writer who had not heard of its existence. The long name of American Association for Scientific Taxation seems unnecessary and misleading. Why not simply The American Land League!

The appeal contained two very valuable proposals—first that no dues or obligations except political cooperation be imposed and second that we depend on systematic petitioning of legislatures. A volume of petitions rolling up every year in every State would put our cause squarely before the American people.

LEWIS H. CLARK, Sodus, N. Y.

A Funny World

WE worry about the morale of the workingman who has to go on relief, because we know that he himself worries. Any decent man prefers to earn the money he spends, and feels himself degraded if he has to take without giving something in exchange.

But nobody worries about the landowner who takes in a big income without earning it. Least of all does he himself worry, about his morale or anything else, even though he is taking without giving anything in exchange.

It's a funny world!—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

The Keynote Convention Speech, 1940

By HON. B. A. PARTYMAN

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

By HARRY GUNNISON BROWN

Author of “The Economic Basis of Tax Reform”

Mr. Chairman; Fellow Delegates to this Great Convention:

AS we meet here to deliberate on the selection of a leader in the campaign which lies before us, and on the formulation of a programme to be carried out during the next four years, it is eminently fitting that we pause a little while and pass a backward glance at the accomplishments and progress of all the states and of the nation during the years, since 1932, that our party has guided the destinies of America. There is a unity in the legislation of the states and of the national government during this period, which can be explained only by the fact that the great party which we represent has guided and directed both.

It sometimes happens that fundamental principles of wide application, which only an insignificant fraction of the people have previously understood, seem to burst suddenly on the popular mind and come to their full flowering in policy during a comparatively few years. Then there ensues a period of material and cultural development which succeeding generations look back upon as a golden age of human progress.

The great twin principles, that high land values are the foundation of prosperity and that taxes on land should be reduced in order to make land values high, have long been understood by the intelligent and substantial few. But it was not until seven or eight years ago, when our great party was waging its successful struggle for control of the national and state governments and during the opening months of the new administration, that these two fundamental principles began really to permeate the understanding of the great multitude. During these critical and significant months, however, it became increasingly clear to an ever increasing proportion of the citizenry that tax relief for land was the one fundamental reform for which all really good citizens, and certainly all landowning citizens, ought to work. For, clearly, the more that was paid in rent to landowners by the remainder of the people for permission to live and to work on the earth in any locations having community-produced situation advantages, and the less of this rent that was taken in taxation by the public, the higher would be the sale value of the land. And if the land was worth more, then each community and the nation would be more prosperous.

There had been, many long years before, a strange

and rather obstreperous sect, sometimes called Single Taxers, who had treated these great principles with disdain and even with derision. The rents paid to landowners, one of these deriders had said, benefited the rest of the people the same way weasels in the henroost benefit the poultry farmer. Another of the Single Taxers had got the habit of annoying prominent and substantial citizens who had developed their communities through collecting rents, by making them listen to a story about a certain Mrs. D. Mentid whose cellar was infested with rats which, she said, were making her daily and hourly more prosperous. Mrs. Mentid would often speak rapturously of her rats. For, obviously, she would say, the more of her potatoes, turnips, carrots, cheeses and hams were consumed by the rats, the fatter and stronger and so the more valuable the rats would be. And if the rats were fatter and stronger—and therefore worth more—Mrs Mentid would be correspondingly more prosperous.

But, fortunately, the membership and the influence of this sect had latterly greatly declined, so much so that many of the literary intelligentsia of parlor pink privities, who write for the high-brow magazines, such as the *New Republic* and the *Nation*, said the species was extinct, like the dinosaur and the pterodactyl and the like, and its philosophy out of date and not worth the attention of such intellectual leaders as themselves. It was very discreditable for an intellectual to harbor ideas which other intellectuals have found to be out of date. So a large part of the intelligentsia, as well as an overwhelming majority of the entire people, were fast coming to realize that taxes on land should by no means be increased, as the Single Taxers had urged, but should, on the contrary, be greatly lowered.

So now in all of the states the people began to demand earnestly and insistently and even clamorously that the taxes on land and sites should be reduced, in order to have more of the annual community-produced rent of land in the possession of the owners of land, and thereby make the land worth more and thereby make the states and the nation more prosperous.

Not only were landowners in general—the really leading and substantial citizens of the nation—favorable to the change; but especially were the owners of vacant lots in favor of it, for, as they said, they were deriving no income from these lots while holding them out of use and ought not to have to pay taxes on property which was yielding them nothing. Furthermore, a large number of the public school teachers, school superintendents and other public employees realized full well that the influential public opinion favored the reduction and even the abolition of taxation on the community-produced value of land, and that increased salaries could come only from other sources, so they were heartily in favor of other sources for taxation and of the reduction of taxation on land. Parent-teacher associations joined

in the crusade to relieve land of taxes, so that they could get more money for the schools and increase thereby the intelligence of the citizenry on such matters as taxation.

To secure the necessary revenues to run the various state and local governments, taxes were levied on the salaries and wages that the people earned by their work and on the capital they saved and constructed and the income from it, on such luxuries of the pampered and idle rich as moving picture entertainments, athletic contests, cigarettes, soft drinks, gasoline and, in many of the states, on all retail sales.

The result was a great tidal wave of prosperity, proving that the fears and predictions of opposition calamity-howlers had been groundless. For these calamity-howlers had overlooked the innate mulishness of the people and were therefore entirely unprepared for the really stimulating effects of the new taxes. The taxes on what people earned by their work goaded them to work harder and more cheerfully and to do much more work, so the country became a veritable hive of industry. The taxes on the capital they constructed and on the income from it instigated them to save and to construct more capital, so thrift became a national trait and the increased capital made industry much more productive. The fact that home owners had to pay more taxes when they improved their homes than when they did not, a time-honored American custom, incited them to do more improving and to buy more lumber and paint, more trees and shrubs, more grass seed and lawn mowers. The taxes on moving picture entertainments aroused among the poorer people a frantic eagerness to attend the movies and thus stimulated the building of theatres and the making of films. The taxes on soft drinks made it so expensive to live comfortably in the cities, and especially in the slums, during the heat of summer, that the poorer people were tempted to buy more second-hand cars and more gasoline and to take their families to the seashore and to the mountains and to various inland lakes for the summer months. But the gasoline tax prevented this. So they stayed in the cities and worked harder in order to be able to pay the taxes, and therefore became thirstier, and therefore consumed more soft drinks, as well as other drinks, and therefore stimulated the employment of soda-fountain clerks and the manufacture of beverages and of bottles and glasses. Finally, the taxes on all retail sales, by leaving, for industry and wages in all lines of production, a smaller per cent of the consumer's dollar, fired the working class with a new and driving ambition—a sort of holy zeal, or righteous rage—and thus made them more prosperous than they had been before the sales taxes were levied.

There was, indeed, one disrupting factor in this scene of joyful activity. The common people in each of the states were so enthusiastic about the substitution of the sales taxes and other taxes levied on them, for taxes on the community-produced situation value of land, that when-

ever a state senator or representative who had voted for the new taxes appeared on the street, all of the day laborers and mechanics and clerks and housewives burst quite spontaneously into cheers and rushed from their work in the sewers and factories and stores and kitchens and pressed about the statesman to congratulate him and themselves and to shake his hand. And the great statesmen in the state legislatures were so pleased at this that they appeared daily and even hourly in public places where the common people could see them. So the business activity resulting from the taxes was not so active as it might have been. But, after all, the disruption of business on these occasions brought diversion and excitement to the working classes, and aroused their patriotism and their pride in their state governments, and so protected and preserved them from the wiles of communists and other dangerous radicals. In fact, one of the very purposes of the new taxes on sales and the like was to make the working people more contented and stop the spread of communist propaganda among them.

But the really important cause of the increasing prosperity was the country-wide reduction of taxation on the community-produced situation value of land. This welcome tax relief for land enabled the owners of land to keep far more than before of the rent which non-owners paid them for permission to live and to work in those parts of the United States where community development made labor effective and life reasonably tolerable, and the fact that the owners could keep more of the rent made their land worth more and so greatly increased prosperity. Reducing the tax on land reduced the penalty of holding land out of use for speculation and made it easier for owners of unimproved land to keep it unimproved until they could get a reasonably high price from those who wanted to use it for industries and homes. The owners were no longer compelled to pay as high taxes as before on land which, since they were holding it vacant and idle, was yielding them nothing. So, in a little while, it came about that approximately half of the building lots in the principal cities and their suburbs, certainly more than before, and many of the mines and potential power sites, and more agricultural land, were being held out of use by speculators who confidently expected the land to rise in value. This increased the demand for the remaining land for industry and to build homes and thereby made land values throughout the nation higher and the people richer.

Although the indirect taxes on many working farmers and on the poorer home owners made their total tax burden heavier than if just the situation rent of their land had been taxed, yet they were richer because their land was worth more. Even if they could not enjoy so good a living, could seldom afford to attend the movies and could have hardly any of the real comforts and luxuries of life, still they were richer because their land would sell for more.

In the central business districts of the big cities, an increasing number of the well-located sites came to have values of several million dollars each, and all the more intelligent people, such as the owners of these sites, recognized such values as an evidence of general prosperity.

Enthusiasm for the new policy was infectious and spread rapidly. Those whose great intellects had enabled them to foresee the adoption of the tax relief system—as well as to urge it—and who had therefore bought plenty of land while it was still cheap, were now rich, and they could afford the leisure to help the rest of the people understand the advantages of relieving land of taxation. Some of the rest of the people were not quite sure about these advantages and needed to have them explained.

There were, to be sure, a few dissentients of the chronic kicker type, who did not like the idea of having land expensive even though property values in the nation were thus increased by billions of dollars, and whom no one seemed able to convince. These dissentients objected that it was now harder for most people to buy homes than it had been, and harder for cities to buy land for playgrounds for the children and for parks, that mortgages were necessary to enable any but the well-to-do to buy land for homes or farms or business, that crowding in the slums was getting worse and that the speculative holding of land out of use was interfering with industry and production and raising the cost of living. What most of the kickers appeared to desire was that the community-produced rental value of land should be the first and principal source of public revenue. It is to be feared that they had been infected with the virus of Single Tax.

But such critics failed to realize the importance of high land values as a foundation of prosperity. Lacking the vision and the breadth of view of the substantial landowning class, they were unable to see beyond the immediate apparent pecuniary interest.

As a matter of fact, it was not alone the owners of land who benefited by the new policy. For it should not be forgotten that from their large and increasing rents the landlord rich were able to employ many a butler, gardeners, caddies, nurse maids, kitchen maid, interior decorators and companions, and to buy jewelry and steam yachts and silks and satins and expensive liquors. Even, therefore, if more did have to be paid by working people for permission to work and to live on the land, this money was spent by the landlords in demands for the services of the poor. So the poor, by enriching the landlords, indirectly enriched themselves.

Although some of the poorer and less educated people could not understand this, it was quite clear to those who were intellectually acute and who could reason out how a person becomes richer by having to pay more to others and by keeping less for himself, because then these others have more with which to demand his goods and service.

Of course it would not have made the landowners richer to tax their rents and give the proceeds to the poor, even though the poor could therewith buy more; but all of the landowners and, indeed, a good many of the poorer people, were able to see how it enriched the poor to pay more of the taxes and more rent to the owners of land. Some of the landowners sacrificed considerable leisure time which they might have enjoyed in playing golf or watching horse races or dog shows or examining and purchasing antiques or travelling in Europe or vacationing in Florida or Hawaii, in order to explain this important economic phenomenon to those of the common people who could be made to understand it.

There were, to be sure, a few of the common people who were too ignorant to get a clear understanding of the matter even with all this explaining. Strange as it may seem, some of these began to burglarize the stores and engage in hold-ups and pick the pockets of copper and steel and coal and oil and gas magnates and of other great landowners. When apprehended they would say that they were merely trying to increase the prosperity of those they appeared to be robbing, that the money they thus secured was spent in buying goods from the very stores they had burglarized and from the very magnates whose pockets they had picked and that so business was stimulated and everybody's prosperity was enhanced.

It was, in truth, most unfortunate that, despite the sacrificial efforts of the owners of natural resources and of valuable city sites to make the recipe of prosperity clear to the common people, such mistaken notions as this should gain currency. Obviously, the incidental disreputable and illegitimate and violent thievery did nothing to raise the value of land and could not, therefore, increase prosperity. Stern repressive measures had to be adopted, and the owners of land and natural resources had to sacrifice even more of their time and money to make the recipe of prosperity understood by the masses generally. But, gradually, even the most ignorant began to see the light, thereby justifying that abiding faith in the intelligence of the common people and in American institutions and in high land values, so eloquently and often professed by the leaders of our great party.

It ought to be noted at this point it was not just indirectly and through the general stimulus to business from high rents and land values that the common people hoped to gain from tax relief for land. A number of the poorer citizens reasonably expected to profit directly from an increase in the value of remote and swampy building lots which they had been able to buy on the installment plan.

* * *

When the farmers and home owners and owners of business sites and the real estate boards and land speculators and teachers, and the people generally, saw what

prosperity was being brought about by the simple expedient of relieving land of taxation, when they realized how the leaving of nearly all of the community-produced rental value of land in the hands of private owners had raised the value of all the land in the country and, by encouraging speculative holding of vacant land, had still further raised this value; they began to wonder if they could not devise other policies to raise the value of land and to promote the prosperity of the nation still more.

It was quickly seen that any further measures, to be effective, must be national in scope, and all the people began to look hopefully to their newly elected President for leadership in this great adventure. The President, who had pledged himself to work in the interests of the forgotten man, saw clearly that this forgotten man was typically the landowner, whose land was worth too little even yet, despite the spread of the tax relief policy among the states, and he did not disappoint an expectant nation. After a careful and statesmanlike consideration of all the important facts, an administration bill was introduced into Congress, which provided that new and additional taxes, to be known as processing taxes, should be levied on various productive processes and that the proceeds should be turned over to agricultural landowners, the rich and prosperous as well as those heavily mortgaged, whose land was being used for production, on condition that they should at once withdraw a large fraction of this land from use. The administration should have the right, if circumstances seemed to warrant, to increase this fraction. Congress passed the new legislation with enthusiasm and alacrity and the new policy was put into effect at once.

The good results were almost immediately manifest. Owners of farms and plantations on which there had been numerous tenants and farm laborers, made haste to terminate their contracts with a large number of their tenants and discharged many of their laborers, their hearts overflowing with gratitude for the wise leadership and statesmanship of the President, who had not failed to remember the long forgotten men to whom God, in his infinite wisdom, had entrusted the land and natural resources of the country. In truth, the day of these forgotten men seemed to have dawned at last and the glory of the rising sun of their prosperity illumined all their thoughts and anticipations.

For the policy of paying owners of land to remove it from use, reduced the amount of land available for farm tenants and farm laborers to work on, and caused them to bid more desperately for the chance to work on the land still left in use, and so enabled owners to charge higher rents and to pay lower wages, and so raised the value of their land. This, of course, made the nation more prosperous, and, therefore, in the end, made wages higher.

A few unthinking critics said it would be better to tax

the rent yielded by the superior land and to pay some of the farm tenants and farm laborers not to work and thus to make farm labor scarce and raise the wages of farm workers, rather than to tax workers in their food and clothing purchases to pay landowners to withdraw their land. Other critics said that if the owners of farm lands were to receive benefit payments from the government, only the more needy ones should receive the payments and the money required should be raised by a tax on the billions of dollars of community-produced value of city land instead of on the necessities of the poor. But what all these critics persistently overlooked was the basic principle underlying the new policy, viz., that high land values are the foundation of prosperity. To pay laborers for not working would most certainly lower land values rather than raise them, and to tax city land might lower its value by even more than the benefits to agricultural landowners raised the value of agricultural land.

But it was important to restore a proper balance between industry and agriculture. New Deal statesmen said they intended to put agriculture on a par with industry. There was much discussion as to what this meant. Many city workers had been out of jobs and, at times, cold and hungry. There had been jobs about as usual in the country. Narrow-minded critics said the President and Congress must be trying to bring about an equal unemployment among cotton croppers and other farm tenants and farm laborers, so that these would be cold and hungry too, in order that agriculture and industry might be on a par with each other. But such critics had no vision whatever of how all the people could be benefitted by making land scarce and raising its value and did not sympathize with the President's policy of aiding the forgotten man.

An unidentified old man—possibly the last living Single Taxer—was heard to remark about this time, in a street crowd down in Mobile, that it must have been the cotton croppers and other farm tenants and laborers of Scottish extraction that the poet, Robert Burns, had in mind when he wrote of "Scots, wha hae wi' Wallace bled." But what idea the old man meant to convey by his remark, no one seemed to know, and he slipped away before anyone had a chance to ask.

It was feared, however, that a considerable number of landowners might be tempted by the high prices of products, induced by the scarcity of them, to use all their land rather than to withdraw part of it from production. To make certain that none would follow a policy so disruptive of the entire New Deal programme, Senator X. sponsored a supplementary act putting a prohibitive tax on the excess output of plantation owners who failed to withdraw a sufficient proportion of their previously productive land from use. This new act effectively prevented too many people from having jobs raising cotton or bailing or ginning it or transporting it. But it was most unfortunate that so much of the valuable

time of Senators had to be spent planning how to make people withdraw land from use. It would have been much better if there had been less good land in the country to begin with, if, for example, the Sahara desert had been located in the South of the United States instead of in Africa.

Because of some complaints that a large number of former tenants were no longer needed on the land and that they were being kicked off to find such living as they could on the relief rolls, Senator N. introduced a bill providing that the government should establish a Farm Home Corporation through which farm tenants and farm laborers who desired to buy farms might be enabled to pay for them in installments. The bonds of the corporation were to be guaranteed by the government. This pleased almost everybody in the Senator's state. A few of the tenants and laborers thought they might possibly be able to buy a little land and, even, eventually pay for it, despite the rising price of land resulting from New Deal policy, if they could pay off their mortgages by easy stages. Even if they were unable to produce enough on the land to pay off these mortgages, at any rate they might be able to live on it several months during which no owner could dispossess them. And, of course, all of the landowners saw clearly that, if such a Farm Home Corporation increased the demand for and the price of land, they could get even more for such land as they might want to sell than the other legislation just by itself would enable them to get. It was obviously proper and desirable to pass laws that would raise the value of land. But to tax land values rather than other things, in order to make land cheap for tenants and laborers to buy, would have been obviously improper as well as inconsistent with much of New Deal policy.

* * *

But the policy of paying landowners to withdraw their land from use was not fully effective, since it applied only to agricultural land. The owners of city land and mines and power sites and oil and gas wells insisted that some of their land should be withdrawn, too, with adequate compensation for withdrawing it. So the President shortly began to consider to what kinds of land and how far his policy should be extended.

Realizing the importance of technically trained expert advice, the President had already put several of the better known young economists of quasi-socialistic sympathies into important official positions and he consulted them frequently. The most distinguished of these, Dr. Z., following somewhat the line of argument of Karl Marx and various other socialists, emphasized the fact that production had become too efficient. Labor-saving machinery and efficiency engineers had been developing rapidly. It should have been possible to see, a generation ago, he said, that the world could be overwhelmed with goods. If, therefore, there was unemployment and a difficulty of finding jobs for the unemployed, this

was not at all due to the speculation in land which had come from the low taxes on land, nor yet was it due to the prosperity-building policy of the President and of the Secretary of Agriculture, of paying landowners to withdraw their land from use. In short, it was neither the speculative holding out of use of land in anticipation of a rise of land prices, nor the formal withdrawal of land from production for the sake of benefit payments, that was decreasing the employment opportunities of wage earners, but what was decreasing these opportunities was the efficient production of goods.

So the policy of restricting output by withdrawing land from use was consistent with the best conclusions of economic analysis and research. Consequently, further steps in the same direction, such as paying city landowners to hold more sites out of use, and owners of oil and coal land and iron and copper mines to hold more of these resources out of use, should be helpful in making the nation even more prosperous through bringing about more competition to use land and making land values still higher, and reducing not only the wheat, corn, cotton and tobacco which could be produced, but also the automobiles, radios, structural steel, oil, coal, shoes, shirts and other goods.

Perhaps, indeed, the national prosperity would be even more effectively promoted and more men given employment, if nearly all of the land could be withdrawn from use and the output of goods reduced by several hundred per cent. But the number of books on economics and sociology, especially those written by socialistically-minded young professors who had become administrators and advisors, should be increased rather than decreased, in order that the common people might learn how desirable it was to withdraw land from use, stimulate a healthy competition among tenants to use land, prevent an excess of goods, and thereby promote the general prosperity.

New legislation was quickly formulated and passed, applying the brilliant New Deal policy to land which had been used for all kinds of production and not merely to agricultural land. Not only did this prevent too great an output of goods to all other sorts, as well as of food and raw materials, and raise all prices, but, by inducing the withdrawal of more land from use than had previously been withdrawn, it concentrated the demand for laborers and tenants and enterprise upon the remaining land and greatly raised the rent and, therefore, the sale value of land. This, of course, made the nation richer than ever and raised wages and increased employment.

(To be Continued.)

TO see land is to discover it, and according to the childish laws of men to discover it is to own it. Ownership gives the right to gather its riches, and to that end kill all who stand in the way, whether they be Indians or white men claiming they saw it first.

"The Tale of Chicago," by EDGAR LEE MASTERS.

Fortieth Anniversary at Arden

THE regular annual celebration of the birth of Henry George and the Fortieth Anniversary of the Delaware Single Tax Campaign was held in the Field Theatre, Sunday, Sept. 1, under favorable conditions, with a very good attendance.

Henry W. Hetzel presided and gave an appropriate biographical sketch of the life and work of Henry George and a synopsis of the history of the work in Delaware in 1895 and 1896. Mr. Hetzel said that Henry George was a brilliant example of the self-made man and that the Single Tax had, in addition to being an appealing fiscal proposal, certain spiritual qualities not apparent in the name. That the only difference between burglary and landlordism is that the latter is legalized. That Mr. Hoover has said that "to abolish poverty we must increase production," but to do this would only increase the value of land and further enrich landlords. The publicity of the Delaware Campaign was highly beneficial to the general Single Tax movement.

Mrs. Anna George de Mille followed Mr. Hetzel and paid tribute to the devotion and golden eloquence of Frank Stephens, one of Arden's founders. Mrs. de Mille reported a very great increase in the interest of people everywhere in our movement. She spoke particularly about the Henry George School of Social Science, paying a well-deserved tribute to Oscar Geiger, its founder, and urging a class in Arden.

Grace Isabel Colbron quoted Henry George's, "Unless its foundations be laid in justice, the social structure cannot stand." She said that our present world situation was proof that the foundations of society were not sound. That there was poverty even when men were fully employed. That labor was poor long before the present depression. That we treat symptoms, not causes. In answer to those who complain that Single Taxers do not go far enough, she said that when men go either to the north or south pole they usually return and tell about it as they can go no farther. Strictly speaking, the only property is what people individually create by their own efforts; that the value of land is a communal product and therefore not property in the true sense. Miss Colbron also paid a fine tribute to the memory of Frank Stephens.

Henry George, 3rd, made a very forceful and convincing statement concerning the basis of the large fortunes of the Astors, the Carnegies and the Rockefellers, which were all derived from law-made privilege. That such natural inequalities in men did not exist but only seemed to be so because of these privileges and the ability to stifle competition. He quoted Thomas Jefferson as saying that crime in this country followed the monopolization of land.

Edwin Ross, Jr., dwelt on the question of compensating landlords. As the Single Tax did not propose to take away title to land, there was nothing for which to compensate; and that if anyone was to be compensated it should be those who have been impoverished by an unjust and stupid system of taxation.

An open forum for questions and answers with an interesting discussion followed the regular meeting.—E. S. Ross.

A Violation of the Creative Spirit

MUSSOLINI not only apes the Imperial Schoolmarm abroad, he apes her senile idiocies at home. In order to diminish as far as possible unemployment among Italian laborers the Inter-Syndical Committee has decided that "no mechanical means whatsoever shall be used for the next harvest." Demented as such a proceeding self-evidently is, it is a perfect reflection of the conduct of our municipalities, which insist on the greatest possible amount of hard labor under their contracts. There can be little risk of peace as long as war is the saner. Production is an aspect of Creation, and the failure to utilize every advance towards supreme efficiency is a violation of the Creative Spirit.—*New English Weekly*.

Tenth Henry George Congress

HOTEL NEW YORKER, NEW YORK CITY, SEPTEMBER 26, 27 AND 28

THE Henry George Congress has met and adjourned. The friendships formed after three days' intimate contact are certain to be renewed by correspondence and future meetings. We have shaken hands across the sea in a very real sense. Arthur Madsen of London and F. Folke of Copenhagen, have cemented a friendship between our workers here and the devoted group of adherents to the Georgist philosophy in the countries from which they come. We have been apprised of what they are doing in England and Denmark, of which many have learned for the first time, and this knowledge is a revelation as well as an inspiration to renewed effort here.

It is time to appraise the value of the Congress itself. It will be remembered that we had certain criticisms to make of the Chicago gathering a year ago. The New York gathering of this year is a distinct improvement.

There are still some criticisms to be made. There is still possible great improvement in these gatherings. There are still defects to be corrected. We were spared a few of the definite disagreements with Henry George with which we have been regaled on previous occasions, disagreements which have no place in such conferences met to renew our faith in the teachings of the master. We do not question the sincerity of the gentlemen who put different interpretations on these teachings, but we must demand that they seek other forums. Their opposition at Henry George Congresses is an illicit intrusion. The Henry George Congress is not a debating society, but a meeting to advance certain definite principles and consider definite lines of action.

Did the Congress succeed in doing this? We think it did. Indeed the activities of the Henry George School of Social Science, opening up a new and tremendously promising sphere of opportunity for advance, impressed all present. Perhaps the only ones who showed impatience with the slow advance were the young student graduates of the School who want to see something done *at once*. Privilege may look to itself in the face of the growing anxiety of the new youthful adherents to the Georgist philosophy to realize the teachings of the master in actual accomplishment. The suggestion of Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett that bills be introduced in every State Legislature of the forty-eight States appealed to them and will find response everywhere. We are more confident that ever of the early realization of our hopes.

Another very hopeful sign at this gathering was the emphasis laid by nearly all the speakers on the individualistic character of our philosophy and the repudiation of Socialism and social planning which includes so much that is definitely antagonistic to our philosophy. There was a consciousness that the Roosevelt policies were

doomed, and that our appeal is to the producers of the world, to capital and business men, for the relief of industry and the preservation of the rights of property. In other words, there was a prevailing tendency to present our doctrines as the sole hope for successful opposition to the confusions of the New Deal and to place in the hands of business leaders, and of labor and capital, the real remedy for poverty and depressions.

We thank the press of the city for the very generous space allowed to the proceedings of the Congress. We differ with our friends who believe that there is a conspiracy of silence among newspapers with regard to our movement. Newspapers will give the news if we provide it for them. The newspapers are still newspapers, not entirely governed by their editorial policy nor by their advertisers. Their advertisers, too, are business men and very much interested at this time in matters of taxation. What interests them will interest the newspapers. As we make news (and in the exact proportion that we make it) the daily press will give us space. We need not be concerned about that.

As to the Congress itself it is necessary to speak. Too much praise cannot be given to the chairman of the Congress, Edward P. Donovan, who presided with skill and dignity.

The "high lights" may be briefly indicated. They include the admirable address of Col. Rule, the report of the Extension Classes of the Henry George School of Social Science from the Field Director of the School, John Lawrence Monroe, the speech of young Bill Trueheart, a fourteen year old boy from Houston, Texas, who knows his economics and is able to express them forcibly and well; the eloquent speech of Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn and the touching tribute to him from his comrade in arms in the Argonne, Hon. Abe D. Waldauer. The appealing figure of the blind rabbi whose words thrilled those present will remain with us for a long time, and the beautiful tribute of his friend will echo in our ears after many incidents of the gathering are forgotten.

Mention must not be omitted of the address of Arthur Madsen, the editor of *Land and Liberty* of London, beloved friend of John Paul, and the interesting account from F. Folke of the real progress made in Denmark. Both Mr. Folke and Mr. Madsen have a keen sense of humor, and let us not be told again that our English friends lack humor. In this sense of humor our Danish representative is not far behind. We should include also in the mention of what we have termed the "high lights" of the Congress the well chosen words of Hon. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, chairman of the Friday night session, and the searching inquiry into our principles and purposes

made by Benjamin W. Burger in his paper, "What to Emphasize in Teaching the Philosophy of Henry George," which we hope to publish some time.

At the banquet Mayor McNair of Pittsburgh regaled us again with his purely American humor. He knew his audience when he said, "Is there anybody here who doesn't want to make a speech," and a good natured laugh went up.

The banquet was a big success. An attendance of over two hundred, each of whom paid \$2.50 for an excellent dinner, was larger than that of any previous Congress. And as if loth to depart the members of the conference stayed after midnight to exchange greetings and farewells. Thus came to an end a memorable, and on the whole a really constructive Henry George Congress.

Opening Session, Sept. 26

REPORTED BY MRS. ADELINE T. MUHLENBERG

THE opening session of the Tenth Annual Henry George Congress began Sept. 26, 1935, at 10 a. m. with Edmund P. Donovan of New York City, chairman of the New York Convention Committee, and Charles Joseph Smith of New York as the chairman of the session. The subject for this session was "The Henry George School of Social Science."

Mr. Donovan gave an address of welcome and introduced Charles Joseph Smith.

Mr. Donovan again resumed the chair and asked that "brevity" be the keynote of the convention. He then introduced the chairman of the session and Mr. Smith took the chair. Mr. Smith said, "the finest method of learning is by way of teaching." He urged that we "keep the sun of our cause rising."

The principal speaker was Otto K. Dorn of New York, Business Manager of the Henry George School of Social Science, who reported on the activities of the School. He called the School "a clearing house for all schools." Mr. Dorn anticipates a larger registration than ever before. The Teacher's Training Classes are becoming more popular.

There followed five minute reports from teachers and alumni students of the School at its National Headquarters as follows:

Roma B. Halpern, graduate of Teachers' Training Course advises that all problems and questions on the work be brought to the class for discussion. The methods of this class were given in detail.

Charles Erwood, present member of the Training Class, left the thought that "most people who study Henry George think they know it better than anyone else."

Stephen Bell, foreign editor of *Commerce and Finance*, spoke on the importance of "free trade" in and out of the movement. He gave a very instructive talk on the tariff, saying "too much attention cannot be given to free trade; it can give all nations and all mankind a place in the sun." Mr. Bell urged a special class at the School on tariffs.

Lancaster Green of New York pleaded for a restimulation of the movement by all. Mrs. H. H. McEvoy of Alaska and Chicago told of her work in Chicago among the colored women.

Morris Van Veen pleaded for imparting the Henry George theory every day of one's life. Mr. A. C. Thompson of Toronto Canada, told of spending an entire lesson on the Malthusian theory with all of his classes.

Mr. Herbert M. Garn of New York addressed the convention. Mr. Smith completed the session. Mr. Donovan then presented to the convention the following distinguished guests who were present:

Marietta Johnson of Fairhope, Ala., Miss Charlotte Schetter of New York, Bill Beach Truehart and Mrs. William Truehart of Houston, Texas, the Messers. Ellert from Milk River, Alberta, Canada, Mr. F. Folke of Denmark and Mr. Arthur Madsen of England.

Second Session, Sept. 26

REPORTED BY MRS. ADELINE T. MULHENBERG

THE second session of the Tenth Annual Henry George Congress convened at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City, on Thursday, Sept. 26, 1935 at 2 p. m. with James F. Oastler of New York as chairman. The subject of this session was "Extension Classes of the Henry George School of Social Science." Mr. John Lawrence Monroe of Chicago, Field Director of the Henry George School of Social Science, was the principal speaker.

Edmund P. Donovan, chairman of the Congress opened the session with announcements of the exhibitions in New York City of first editions and galley sheets of "Progress and Poverty" and other writings of Henry George at the New York Public Library, and the portrait of Henry George as painted by an American artist, George de Forrest, and donated to the Metropolitan Museum by August Lewis who commissioned the portrait.

Mr. Donovan introduced Mr. Oastler who, after his greetings and expediting of the subject in turn presented John Lawrence Monroe. Mr. Monroe told of his visits to different parts of the country and Canada, and reported the extent and progress of the movement. "There are too few people who know," said Mr. Monroe. He urged the use of radio, class work and the press, to arouse the interest of the country. An outline of the methods of teaching was given and systems of attracting students presented. "Realize," said Mr. Monroe, "the power of education to spread this teaching."

Mr. Oastler then presented a number of speakers from various parts of the country to give five minute reports on Extension Classes as follows:

Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn of Cincinnati, reported the progress of classes by personal contacts, the radio, and the press. "Acquaint the world with Henry George's teachings," was the message that he left with us.

Dave Margolis of Cleveland, O., spoke.

Richard E. Howe of Pittsburgh, reported on the class movement in that city.

Robert C. Bowers contrasted the success of the present as compared with the past in Pittsburgh.

Bill Beach Truehart of Houston, Texas, representing a splendid example of the youth of today and the interest that can be created in and among the younger generation, interested this session immensely. Mrs. William Truehart, mother of this youth, and the instructor of a class of high school boys in Houston on the teachings of Henry George followed. Eva L. Maxwell of New York and Danbury, responsible for the organization of class work in Connecticut, spoke hopefully of our progress.

Dr. Elizabeth E. Bowen of Newark, N. J., left some very constructive messages on teaching by the use of the blackboard; in assisting the reading by summary work; by giving a thorough understanding of the "seven terms."

J. B. Ellert, Milk River, Alberta, Canada, spoke of his success in giving the Henry George philosophy to others by the spoken word. He drew his examples from Milk River, his home town, the town of the Single Tax. Miss Zarah Dupont of Cambridge, Mass., spoke. W. W. Monroe, of Schenectady, a Henry George follower for fifty years, said he is prepared to teach four classes every week.

Hartley Dennett, East Alstead, N. H., was now heard, and Mrs. Anna George de Mille, daughter of Henry George who reported the results of the progress of her efforts in California during the summer, F. Folke of Denmark, who has helped to spread the Henry George

theory in Denmark, gave us the thought "one cannot teach the principles of Henry George without thoroughly understanding them."

Mr. Arthur Madsen of England related the progress made in his country. He suggested the publication of a summary of "Progress and Poverty" so that it might be placed in the hands of prospects as well as students.

Dr. Bowen announced that she had in her possession an original newspaper, *The New York World*, wherein many years ago Henry George himself had published a complete summary of "Progress and Poverty." Mr. Edmund P. Donovan then closed the meeting with the announcement of the evening session.

Evening Session, Sept. 26

REPORTED BY CHAS. ERWOOD

MR. LANCASTER GREEN, as chairman opened the meeting and introduced Mrs. Marietta Johnson of Fairhope, Ala. Mrs. Johnson began her address by urging that Georgists and Socialists should come together in their fight for social equality. She expressed the belief that the Socialists would see that the socialization of land value would accomplish the aim of social justice without having recourse to the rest of the Socialist programme; that they would be content with this fundamental step and not try to socialize capital as well.

Most interesting was her theory that children are brought up to expect injustice, and she went on to explain that external standards set up by schools and parents foreordained many to failure. She criticized the school system as closing the mind to truth; learning to accept truth on authority instead of accepting truth for authority. Schooling must meet the need of the individual instead of forcing the individual into a fixed pattern.

Mrs. Johnson laid our present difficulty to lack of purchasing power and strongly advocated the Townsend Plan as a remedy, but stipulated that the pension must be paid by collecting economic rent.

Mr. Waldauer of Memphis, Tenn., opened his address with the now celebrated story of his first Single Tax speech at the age of thirteen.

He then spoke feelingly of his meeting with Rabbi Aaronsohn in France in the Argonne and of the comradeship known to men who have faced death together, and said, "Great as was that comradeship, it cannot compare with the comradeship known to the followers of Henry George."

Mr. Waldauer told of the fight to stop sales tax legislation in the State of Tennessee, and drew comparisons between Tennesseans' and New Yorkers' reactions to sales tax legislation that was not at all complimentary to New Yorkers. He quoted from a letter of Enoch Emsley who, long before George, had written, "Never tax anything that would be of value to you or your State, that could or would run away, or that could or would come to you."

In closing Mr. Waldauer said that despite the general illiteracy in Tennessee there was more tax literacy than in many sections of the country, and that he hoped to see sales taxes and all other forms of taxation on production abolished in the near future.

Rabbi Aaronsohn referred to this as his maiden speech at a Henry George Congress and hoped that it would be the first of many.

The Rabbi went on to say that most conventions are called to benefit some partisan interests, to gain privilege for some group or individuals; but that this convention was called for an unselfish cause and a noble purpose.

The chief object of this gathering should be to choose the best way of spreading the philosophy of Henry George, and the only way to fill the empty press section would be to knit the followers of Henry George into a close compact army. "We cannot look upon ourselves merely as disciples of a great teacher, but must also be warriors, girt for battle, ready to fight a series of orderly engagements instead of the present guerrilla warfare against injustice and corruption."

He was enthusiastic about the work of the Henry George Fellowship and the Henry George School and said that the Fellowship should be the mother institute of the Georgist movement, the heart and the guiding mind.

Rabbi Aaronsohn paid tribute to the work of Tom L. Johnson, Louis F. Post, and Oscar H. Geiger, all of whom he regarded as heroes of the Georgist movement.

Morning Session, Sept. 27

MR. DONOVAN introduced Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett as chairman of this session which was devoted to legislative methods. Mrs. Dennett introduced James G. Blauvelt, who ran for United States Senator on the Republican ticket in New Jersey, and who is president of the Henry George League of that State. He congratulated the Congress on the progress of the Georgist cause. He paid a deserved tribute to Graham Peace for his work, "The Great Robbery."

Mrs. Dennett now called upon P. R. Williams, secretary of the Henry George Foundation, who responded briefly. Walter Fairchild spoke for the Society for Scientific Taxation, and told of the bills recommended by the society to the legislature, which now rest in committee.

Mrs. Dennett advocated the introduction of Single Tax bills in every State, such bills to conform to circumstances. A greater stimulation would thus be afforded, giving an opportunity to those who wanted to do something for the cause.

Joseph Dana Miller reported for California by reading portions of a letter from Hon. Jackson H. Ralston and submitting the following telegram:

State Federation of Labor at San Diego with five hundred delegates today unanimously endorsed again the constitutional amendment and instructed its executive board to further its adoption at the polls in November, next year.—JACKSON H. RALSTON.

Other speakers were Congressman Moritz, Donald Marcellus, Harold Sudell, the latter reading a bill, which he had prepared, for Philadelphia.

Mr. Ewing and Mr. Leubuscher also spoke.

Afternoon Session, Sept. 27

THIS session was called to order by Mr. Bowers of Pittsburgh, who announced that the principal speaker Mr. Schwartz was unable to be present. The same announcement was made respecting Henry George Atkinson.

Miss Antoinette Kaufmann reviewed the work of the Schalkenbach Foundation, and the history of the movement since 1897, and answered a number of questions.

Mrs. Gertrude E. Mackenzie spoke for the Women's Washington Single Tax organization.

Mrs. Eva Maxwell reported for the *Forum and No Taxes* of Stockton, Calif., and Mr. Miller reported for LAND AND FREEDOM.

Mr. Edward Polak detailed his efforts, which were remarkably successful, in the High School Essay contests and the Forum which he established some years ago. He advocated a policy of "boring from within" through the dominant parties. In 1922 we did this and were successful in establishing a ten year exemption, of improvements from taxation, which gave a great impetus to building.

Alfred M. Chandler reported for activities in New Jersey and the bill which received 22 votes, lacking only nine of adoption.

Mrs. Bessie Beach Truehart of Houston, Texas, stressed the necessity of appealing to the masses.

The speakers also included George Lloyd, Chas. Johnson Post, Mrs. McAvoy, Mrs. DuBois and others.

International Night, Sept. 27

REPORTED BY DONALD MARCELLUS

THIS session was presided over by Hon. Charles O'Connor Hennessy.

An address on "Land Value Taxation in Politics and in Practice in Denmark," was delivered by Mr. Folke.

Mr. Folke described the long battle and slow evolution of Georgian principles in Denmark. The outstanding events were: abolition of serfdom in 1788, the adoption of a democratic constitution in 1849, the growth of cooperatives which gave the small farmers power against the landed proprietors, the famous scientific land valuation carried out between 1805 and 1826, the bringing of Georgian teachings to Denmark by Jacob Lange in 1884, assessments at one hundred per cent of market value in 1903, separate assessment of land and buildings in 1916 and the financing and land settlement acts of 1899 and 1919. Under the financing provisions of these acts about ten per cent of Danish farms came into existence. In 1932 tax exemption of all farm improvements and part of city improvements was achieved, also a tax on land value increases which had the interesting effect of inducing landholders to make a true declaration of the value of their holdings. Also at this time the Georgists succeeded in getting subsidies for farmers in place of tax reductions.

The importance of the Danish achievements can be partially judged by realizing that up until 1930 Denmark had more commerce than any other nation in relation to the size of its population, and that practically all Danish farmers owned their own farms as contrasted with our ever growing proportion of tenant farmers. They have far to go yet as is made apparent by the fact that they only take 1.4 per cent of the total taxable land value but their legislation is progressively building up to achieve pure Single Tax.

The grain-dumping activities of America forced England to give up her agriculture and forced Germany to take refuge behind tariffs but Denmark built up a new agricultural industry. The Danish farmers also proved that small farms were as efficient producers as large ones. (This will be of particular interest to the advocates of the large scale plans of the Technocrats.)

Mr. Folke's description of the defensive tactics of the Georgists was particularly interesting. Attempts to substitute *income taxes* for land taxes were parried by showing that this *would favor the rich* (they would pay lower taxes on their incomes than they had to pay on their speculative lands) *those that received the most services from the community and those that improved their farms the least*. When in the agriculture crisis of 1930, attempts were made to reduce land taxes, it was pointed out by the Georgists that the debt burden was more oppressive than the tax burden and that the debt burden would increase if taxes were reduced.

Other speakers at this session were Arthur Madsen of London, Alan Thompson of Toronto and Col. Victor A. Rule of Chicago.

Morning Session, Sept. 28

REPORTED BY MRS. EVA L. MAXWELL

IN the absence of Mr. Jesse M. Zeeman, Col. Victor A. Rule presided.

Mr. Benjamin W. Burger, the speaker of the session, took for his subject, "What to Emphasize in Teaching the Philosophy of Henry George."

He said our philosophy can find acceptance only in the well-ordered mind, those who sense a divine order in the universe, for we see things not as *they* are but as *we* are. Therefore to understand the Georgist philosophy requires for the ordinary mind the establishment of a new viewpoint. He must understand the fundamentals of political economy. Mr. Burger then listed six qualities which distinguish land from private property, as follows:

1. The earth is not produced by man, but is the gift of the Creator, for the equal use of all.
2. It is limited in quantity.
3. It is essential to existence.
4. It does not owe its value to anything that landowners choose to put upon it.
5. It owes its value entirely to the presence and activities of the community.
6. It cannot be carried away or concealed.

As in law, there are five points to establish the necessity for the collection of ground rent. The First is that man in his physical aspect is a land animal.

As Georgists we are radical. We place the emphasis on land as the essential, while the Socialist places it on the non-essential, capital. The Second point we must establish is that all human beings have an equal right to live on the earth. The Third point, that the earth cannot be privately owned follows from the first two. The Fourth point is that land rent measures the desirability of different locations. And, Fifth, the most difficult to establish to the satisfaction of beginners is, that by using ground rent for our common needs, we secure for each and every human being the equal right to live.

It is of vital importance if we would be understood, that the terms of political economy, land, labor, capital, rent, wages and interest mean exactly the same to our hearers as they mean to us.

Mr. Roy A. Folke, of Dun and Bradstreet, discussed the effects of land speculation on business enterprises. He established the fact that speculative increase in land value causes an undue proportion of income to go to rent. The economic function of business is to produce goods and services. Too large an investment in land leads to bankruptcy.

Discussion followed from the floor. Mrs. Marietta Johnson of Fairhope, Ala., urged that we bring our gospel to church people. She said that love was impossible if we allow individuals to take what they do not produce, or if society takes from individuals what they produce. There was further discussion by Professor Oppenheimer, author of "The State," Miss Charlotte Schetter, Messrs. Leubuscher, Fiske Warren, Foley, Tynes, Odgen, Marcellus, Olcott and others. They further emphasized that we must put this fundamental teaching in language the people can understand.

Meeting Board of Directors of Henry George Foundation

CLAYTON J. EWING presided and Edward P. Donovan thanked the officers of the Foundation for the fine cooperation established between the official body and the committee of arrangements of which he was chairman. He suggested the formation of a more militant organization and spoke of the work being done in Great Britain of which Mr. Madsen had told us.

The officials of the Foundation were re-elected at this meeting and Miss Grace Isabel Colbron, on motion of Mr. Leubuscher, was elected to the Board and Miss C. H. Fuller was elected on motion of Mr. Miller.

Mr. P. R. Williams reported for the Foundation.

Mr. Waldauer advocated enclaves for land reverting to the States where anybody could go to the land on a ninety-nine year lease.

On motion of Mrs. de Mille the thanks of the board was given to the efficient chairman of the Congress, Edward P. Donovan.

Resolutions having been ruled out of convention proceedings the following resolution suggested by Mr. Ewing had been drawn up and introduced at this meeting by Mr. Miller.

Believing that the principal cause of wars is the hunger for land and the policy of greedy nations in the grabbing of territory, and

Believing also that the imposition of tariffs that strangle trade divide peoples into hostile camps, thus accentuating the temptation to conflict, we call attention to the need of considering the teachings

of Henry George who pointed out a way for the destruction of these peace-destroying institutions, the freeing of Industry from tariff barriers, and the establishment of the natural rights of man to the lands of nations, thus bringing about a reign of universal peace.

Visit to the Grave of Henry George

REPORTED BY M. VAN VEEN

ON Saturday, Sept. 28, about one hundred members of the Henry George Congress availed themselves of the opportunity of paying tribute at the grave of our great leader Henry George in his resting place in Greenwood cemetery.

Most of those present went, owing to the thoughtfulness of the Committee, in a huge stage, while others went by the subway.

A most beautiful and fitting tribute was made by Col. Victor A. Rule, in the absence of Hon. Peter Witt who was to have made the memorial address. Called upon at short notice thanks are due to Col. Rule for his beautiful and feeling tribute to our great leader.

This was followed by an address by F. Folke, of Denmark, who explained that the heather flowers which he laid upon the grave were gathered by his fellow countrymen to be so placed.

Mr. Madsen followed with an eloquent address, and in behalf of the English followers presented a beautiful wreath which was placed at the foot of the monolith. Mr. Madsen said: "He is alive with the spirit of those who are alive with his thought."

All agreed that they had been present at a beautiful ceremony that they would cherish as an imperishable memory.

Banquet Henry George Congress

REPORTED BY MRS. MARGARET F. BINGHAM

THE Tenth Annual Henry George Congress came to an impressive close on Sept. 28, when over two hundred people gathered at a banquet in the ballroom of the Hotel New Yorker.

Mr. Edmund P. Donovan, to whose intelligent and capable direction much of the success of the Congress was due, acted as toastmaster. Mr. Donovan, an Englishman, modestly yet humorously referred to his selection as Chairman of the New York Convention Committee. Mr. Leonard T. Recker had notified him of his appointment. Said Mr. Donovan, "I was a stranger in a strange land, and Mr. Recker took me in—and how."

First to be introduced was Mr. Percy R. Williams, secretary of the Henry George Foundation, and Chief Assessor of Pittsburgh. Mr. Williams reminded the gathering that conventions are merely a means to an end, and expressed the conviction that all had profited by this one. Reporting on conditions in Pittsburgh, he gave the satisfying information that the Mayor, the Administration, and a majority of the Board of Assessors, are Single Taxers.

Mr. Helmuth Moller, First Vice Consul of the Kingdom of Denmark, son of a prominent Danish Georgist, introduced the next speaker, Mr. F. Folke of Denmark, President of the Henry George Society of Denmark. Mr. Folke brought resolutions of greeting from that body. He spoke of the difference between America and Denmark. America is young, strong, with conditions of life new and different from those of Europe. The Danes, on the other hand, occupy an old, small country, hemmed in by the sea. They can hope for nothing by strength; their only hope is through justice. Theirs is a happy country, however, for every child is true heir to his fatherland, as Henry George advocated. Although Denmark, too, has unemployment, quotas, and restrictions, freedom and equality permeate the spirit of the people. Mr. Folke gave a disarming account of his impressions of New York. Although prepared by pictures for the skyline and for skyscrapers, he was thrilled and de-

lighted by seeing them. This, he said, is what a people can do with even a little freedom and democracy, such as we have had. Now that free land is gone, democracy has lost its foundation. America must return to true democracy and the principles of Henry George. It will then be the happy country of the world.

Mr. Arthur Madsen, of London, editor of *Land and Liberty*, told of his first contact with the idea of the Single Tax, years ago, in East London, Cape Province, Africa. From 1909 he was associated with John Paul at the United Committee for Land Value Taxation. An interesting trend in Great Britain today is shown by the fact that Sheffield, England, and Cardiff, Wales, have separately called upon all cities to join in petitioning Parliament to shift taxes to land values. Mr. Madsen spoke of the misunderstanding on the part of Liberals as well as Protectionists on the meaning of "laissez-faire." It is not obsolete, as they think, nor does it mean "Let things alone." It means "LET THINGS BE DONE," and was originally said by the French Physiocrats to a government whose taxation was restricting enterprise.

The entire gathering stood for a minute of silent tribute to the Single Taxers who have passed on during the last year,—to Frank Stevens, William Black, Francis Maguire, Judge Robert Minor, and Mrs. Julia Goldzier.

The Hon. William McNair, Mayor of Pittsburgh, then spoke. He made the telling point that the people must select as law makers men really fitted for their jobs, with a knowledge of economics. Henry George schools throughout the country will provide them. From leaders produced by the schools, the masses will get the idea that community value should be taken for community purposes. When they realize what economic rent is, they will take it.

Mrs. Anna George de Mille read an inspiring letter written by her father to Father Dawson, of Dublin, in which he explained his dedication to the cause of freedom.

A fitting valedictory to the banquet, and, indeed, to the Convention itself, was uttered by Mr. Folke. All winds of Europe, he said come from the west. Many messages have been sent from the new country to the old; that of Benjamin Franklin, who tore the lightning from heaven, and the sceptre from tyranny; that of Woodrow Wilson, whose name will never be forgotten in Denmark; that of Henry George, true Democrat, and prophet of freedom and justice.

Mr. Folke's Speech Before Grave of Henry George Greenwood Cemetery

I AM here on behalf of the Danish Henry George Union to do honor to the memory of our great leader in gratitude for what he has given to each of his followers: an active and fertile viewpoint on the central economic question in our social life, a firm belief in the future of mankind, an ideal to fight for, a service to render our country in memory of the sacrifice of our ancestors and in hope for the future of our children. The influence of Henry George was not limited to his followers. In my country his name is known and honored everywhere by the people. He was a teacher to my people—a benefactor to Denmark.

This name of honor is generally attributed to those who founded universities, who built hospitals and charitable institutions. In my country most of this work is rendered as public service. Our true benefactors are those who taught our people to understand themselves, their needs, their duties and responsibilities. These Henry George gave to many of the best of my people.

The wreath I bring has been bound by Danish friends of Henry George. It is composed of heather-flowers, the beauty of our heaths, which now are disappearing under the ploughs of our smallholders. For in Denmark such work is not accomplished by companies, but

by the individual energy of independent small farmers. They are our pioneers, and they are filled with the pioneer desire for free accessible land. They became more than any others the followers of Henry George. In 1926 their representatives received Henry George's daughter as a princess coming back to her own country. Might his message be so received all over the world by those who are seeking freedom, equality and justice.

L' Envoi

ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE—CONCLUSION AT DINNER—
SEPT. 28.

I AM sure that those of us who have been attending the Conference feel so enthused by the reports of work being accomplished in very many directions that we are all keen to get back in the fight and are indeed "rarin' ter go."

Most of us who have been in the Henry George movement have found it difficult, at times, to keep our light burning in this darkened world, and to know that now it burns more brightly than for many a long year, is indeed encouraging.

For those great souls who blazed the trail for us to follow, who were and always must be our inspiration, our gratitude grows stronger as, with our own struggle to impress a confused humanity, we realize the courage and fortitude demanded of them. They have left us a great heritage as well as a great responsibility and the faith that was theirs in the past, gives us faith for the future—a faith to be carried high like a gleaming banner.

It is not merely our common desire to bring about an economic reform which links us so strongly that we have learned to respect our differences as to method in the accomplishment of our high purpose; it is a spiritual bond that makes for tolerance and understanding—a fraternity—a fellowship that must carry our cause to victory.

Some of you will remember the letter written by Henry George to Father Dawson of Dublin, in answer to the priest's urging him to join the Catholic Church:

"I care nothing for creeds. It seems to me that in any Church or out of them one may serve the Master. . . . And in my way in the line that duty has seemed to call me, that I have tried to do Once in daylight and in a city street, there came to me a thought, a vision, a call—give it what name you please. . . . And then and there I made a vow. Through evil and through good, whatever I have done and whatever I have left undone, to that I have been true. It was that that impelled me to write "Progress and Poverty" and that sustained me when all else failed. . . . It has never left me; it is constantly with me. . . .

"In many different forms and in many different ways men may serve the Master. . . . Each in the station to which he has been called, let us do what is set us, and we shall not clash. From various instruments, set to different keys, comes the grand harmony."

It has not been given to many to see a vision—save as that vision comes transmuted into the golden message from one who *has* seen. But such a message has been written across our lives and most of us here have made the vow of dedication and we who have collected to be helped and to help one another—can go forth again our several ways—"each in the station to which he has been called" knowing "that from our various instruments, set to different keys, will come the Grand Harmony."

So linked as we are, tonight when we part, we do not say goodbye but rather—*au revoir, auf wiedersehen, paa gemsyn*,—and as rare Ben Johnson hath put it:

" . . . in the hope to meet
Shortly again and make our absence sweet."

CHICAGO like Carthage was founded by cheating the natives out of their land.

EDGAR LEE MASTERS, in "Tale of Chicago."

Address--Antoinette Kaufmann Executive Secretary of the Schalkenbach Foundation

THE following is a resumé of a talk given by Miss Antoinette Kaufmann at the Friday afternoon session, Sept. 27, of the Tenth Annual Henry George Congress at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City.

* * * *

At the time when Henry George lived, wrote, and campaigned, the force of his personality and the new truth which his message brought, combined to set in motion a great political campaign. Nationwide publicity and awareness were the inevitable results, and the Single Tax movement in 1897 reached its peak of power and popular interest.

After the tragic passing of the leader, groups and individuals carried on for many years. The Fels Fund poured resources into the hands of those who were working politically in a number of States throughout the Union, and this fund undertook a systematic printing and distribution of George's writings. The Great War saw the close of its activity. There were still faithful workers all over the country who continued individual effort, but in the long stretch from 1917 to 1925, with the exception of the work of a few men and women who maintained such organizations as the Manhattan Single Tax Club, the *Single Tax Review*, now known as LAND AND FREEDOM, etc., the movement had no definite headquarters.

Robert Schalkenbach, the head of Rankin & Co., a large printing firm in this city, and the then President of the New York Typothetae (New York Employing Printers Association,) was devoted to the principles set forth by Henry George. In November, 1924, he passed away, and it was found that he had, in his will, set up a trust fund out of his modest fortune for the purpose of spreading the ideas of Henry George through the printing of Henry George's books. This Fund was named after its founder, the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, twenty-one trustees being appointed, to serve without remuneration, as a Board of Directors. An Executive Committee of five was chosen by this board to govern the policies of the Foundation.

In 1926 it began its work. It was found at that time that the books of Henry George were practically out of print and unavailable in book shops, and many libraries in the country had worn editions left over from 1897 or from early Fels Fund donations. It was found also in this period of so-called, and comparative "prosperity," that there was that scant knowledge of Henry George and his teachings, and the general disposition of the press was to ridicule George as outmoded and fallacious in theory.

The schools and colleges had practically lost all con-

nection or interest in George's teachings and if any mention was made in the economics courses, it was perfunctory and confined to a discussion of the "Single Tax" as a fiscal reform, with no discussion of the broad aspects of justice and economic freedom that are involved in any intelligent treatment of the subject.

The first duty, then, was to prepare an edition of "Progress and Poverty," and "Protection Or Free Trade," the two most important writings of George. This was done, and over 1,500 libraries throughout the country were presented with copies of "Progress and Poverty." At the same time, work was begun upon an abridgement which would attract those who felt they could not take the time to read the unabridged work. Our first President, Mr. Charles T. Root, conferred with John Dewey, and obtained from him the very beautiful "Appreciation of Henry George" which appears in the little abridgement which was finally evolved from the pen of Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown, and which is entitled, "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty."

The Foundation began an advertising campaign to build up the name and fame of Henry George, and throughout the years of its work, has attracted thousands of outsiders to a reading of George through this method of printing George's writings and then advertising them either in newspapers and magazines, or by direct mail. Lately, the Fund, having diminished somewhat, has not been able to sustain this advertising, but the contacts made during the years when this work was carried on, have been the basis for nation-wide activity. Many of the people so attracted, are now students of Henry George, having "followed through" by reading not only "Progress and Poverty," but other writings, and they have become leaders of classes in cities throughout the country, as established by the Henry George Extension Class programme.

Not only has the Foundation placed George's books, one by one, in print, and obtained for them a place in the book stores of the country, and a nation-wide distribution among individuals, but it has maintained in its office a voluminous correspondence from the year 1926 to date, which has been effective in the following manner:

Inquiries were answered; suggestions were given where people expressed a desire to do constructive work in their communities; news of progress was disseminated to people long out of touch; and in short, field work tending to keep the movement together and stimulate activity was accomplished through this consistent attention to correspondence.

The people on our lists constituted a nucleus and the beginning of what might be a national enrollment, and there is in this office an index card for every active Single Taxer, which is literally a picture of the extent of in-

terest the individual has displayed during the past years.

Much of the favorable attitude of the press can be traced to the quality and timeliness of material sent to editors at stated intervals. This work of late has been extended to include radio commentators, and since these men in many cases conduct syndicated news columns, the publicity is extensive if the material sent happens to interest them to the point of writing on it.

When books were launched, reviews were made up with adequate information of the history and subject ready to hand for the editors' use. The clippings from the press have been watched over a period of years, and favorable editorial comment has been noted and made use of wherever possible.

The Foundation considers that it has accomplished something very definite in the schools and colleges. It has obtained the interest of the teachers of economics in many of the major universities, and it has kept every economics department advised twice a year of the material available for teaching Henry George in the economics course. We have reported from time to time in the pages of this magazine, the comments of educators. The latest received is merely a postcard from a teacher in a Southern college, who says:

"I am anxious to secure a picture of Henry George for our economics classroom collection. I am requiring my students in advanced theory to read "Progress and Poverty."

Briefly the statistics as to the book distribution are:

41,762 "Progress and Poverty," both abridged and unabridged.

16,652 other Henry George titles.

58,414 Total since 1926.

Over 800,000 pamphlets and tracts.

It may be noted that in the forty-five years from 1897 to 1932, the figures on the distribution of George's books by the publishers who formerly handled them, are 57,000 volumes, or, the approximate equal for forty-five years of our nine years work.

Our President, Mr. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, who has been president since 1927, is also honorary head of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, an international organization that keeps in touch through the London office of *Land and Liberty*, conducted by Arthur Madsen, with Georgists throughout the world.

Much correspondence is maintained in the Foundation office with foreign Single Tax groups. It was our president's splendid inspiration to invite Lord Snowden to this Tenth Annual Congress, and while Lord Snowden could not attend, he sent the magnificent statement to the Congress which appears elsewhere in this issue.

This letter has received comment from the press as o.

ciations. Our president was also instrumental in the preparation of that remarkable document entitled, "Economic Causes of War and Industrial Depression," which was presented to the League of Nations at Geneva in May, 1927.

There are two conclusions that Single Taxers and others who read this article might well arrive at. One is, that the work of the Foundation is not merely book publication and distribution, but a broader, deeper service to the cause. A service that is carried past the time when the individual gets the book, on into the time when, through a reading of it, he becomes interested. At that point the Foundation places him in touch with the Henry George School in order that he may go forward to a systematic study of Henry George, and a widening of personal influence for the cause in his community.

The other conclusion we would have the reader reach is, that the work of the Foundation has been on a stable basis, that it has been effective and constructive at all times, and carried on at some periods under great difficulties because the Fund which was left,—modest to begin with,—has not been large enough to yield an income sufficient to carry on the work upon any scale commensurate with the needs as they are today.

There has been no extra overhead, the work being carried on by "dollar-a-year" men of the Board, and by the undersigned as paid secretary, with exactly one office helper.

Any aid that can be given to supplement the Fund, or to augment its usefulness in the future, will indeed be a worthy and fruitful action. All support that can be given in distribution of pamphlets and books will help the general printing fund. All word that can be given to newcomers about the Foundation and about the books will immensely help our cause.

IT is now recognized at least that there is a social problem of distribution. That much is gained. No longer do we hear from the impenetrably thoughtless that men are poor because they are lazy or improvident. Ten million men seeking employment and unable to find it have finally stilled that stupid explanation. Other stupidities have taken its place, but this one is banished forever. Too many of those who are *not* improvident have seen their savings swept away as the avenues of employment closed against them.

CAN you imagine an embalming a library of works on political economy? Just a collection of mummies. And would you not feel very much like the American in "Innocents Abroad" who refused to take any interest in mummies and wanted to see instead a "good live corpse." These mummies will soon seem so ancient that we will be justified in voicing such a request. Already these writers seem to belong to a remote antiquity—there is not a nice fresh corpse among them.

From the Rt. Hon. Viscount Snowden

DEAR MR. HENNESSY:

I thank you for your cordial invitation to attend the Congress of the followers of Henry George which is to be held in New York at the end of September.

I much regret that I am unable to undertake the long journey, but I would like to send you a few lines to express my best wishes for the success of the gathering.

There never was a time when the need was greater than it is today for the application of the philosophy and principles of Henry George to the economic and political conditions which are scourging the whole world.

The root cause of world's economic distress is surely obvious to every man who has eyes to see and a brain to understand. So long as land is a monopoly, and men are denied free access to it to apply their labor to its uses, poverty and unemployment will exist. When the land monopolists do permit the use of land they do so on terms which extort its full economic value.

Speaking of England particularly, there never was a time when land values were increasing so rapidly, and it is not an unrelated fact that for the last few years we have had the largest volume of unemployment in our history.

At the time I write Europe is trembling on the brink of an Imperialist War, the magnitude and consequences of which no man can calculate. The root cause of this impending conflict is land acquisition for the purpose of alien exploitation. All the diabolical machinery of modern warfare is to be employed to crush the independence of a defenseless State and to appropriate its land.

In its saner moments every country admits the ruin which is being inflicted on world trade by protection and other methods of artificially created hindrances to the free flow of Commerce; but selfish interests and a perverted nationalism keep the nations in economic bondage.

Great Britain's departure from Free Trade has been a disaster, not only to herself but to the world at large. We no longer can set an example to the world of the advantages of a Free Trade policy. Our Protectionist policy is corrupting the political life of the country and creating vested interests at the expense of the community.

Permanent peace can only be established when men and nations have realized that natural resources should be a common heritage, and used for the good of all mankind. It is to inculcate this fundamental truth that your Congress is meeting, and I hope the day is not far distant when it will be universally appreciated; and then will be the age of Freedom based on Eternal Justice.

Remarks of Clifford H. Kendal

IN my opinion it is time for the followers of Henry George to stand for what he advocated and not for what he opposed. For years we have followed a so-called liberal policy toward Socialism notwithstanding George opposed it both in his speeches and writings.

If the philosophy of Henry George is really understood it will be found one of pure individualism. It follows basic law, viz, inherent rights only in the individual, and the creation of the State by the individual as an instrument of public service, the State having no inherent rights but only temporary conferred powers.

Also I feel we have come to a time when we should be outspoken in our condemnation of the New Deal and what it has done, its poverty-breeding, socialistic attempts to cure the depression, thereby retarding even temporary recovery.

I feel quite certain that most of you, based as you are on fundamental economics, will agree with me in this matter, and, in the absence of resolutions, will do all you can to let it be known that we

stand for the real rights of property, that we oppose confiscation, restriction of production, sales taxes, etc.

Business is sick and is growing sicker still of recurring industrial depressions, at the same time feeling that such visitations are inevitable. Every legitimate and productive interest cannot afford to do otherwise than investigate the teachings of Henry George. For the alternative and probable course of events is Socialism or Communism, short production, money tinkering, inflation, and government interference with business. Opposed to all this Henry George offers a simple and constructive programme based on natural law, a system of sound economics and a true basis of statesmanship.

I repeat, it is time to take our stand against Socialism and let the world know that what we advocate is in line with sound finance, sound business and encouragement of initiative and in all things, in conformity with the natural order.

Extension Classes of the Henry George School

AS the Henry George School of Social Science opens its third school year we find its classes in forty-two cities of the United States, two in Canada and one in Mexico, with prospects of extensions of the School being established in England, New Zealand, and other countries.

No one can see between the lines of this record of growth from one class in 1933, without sensing its significance.

100,000 active Georgists in America!

This is the immediate goal of the School. You can help attain it in five years or less by becoming one of a thousand teachers to use "Progress and Poverty" as the textbook and the Teachers' Manual as a guide. What others are doing you can do. These are some of the cities where classes are opening this fall:

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.

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

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

CONNECTICUT

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

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:* Miss Zara du Pont, 32 Shepard Street, Cambridge.

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.

MIDDLETOWN. *Extension Secretary:* Z. K. Greene, 39 Washington Street.

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, Rousseau, Ontario.

MEXICO

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

JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE.

Congress Notes

Mrs. Adeline T. Mühlenberg who covers for this issue of LAND AND FREEDOM the first two sessions of the Henry George Congress is a graduate of John Luxton's Brooklyn class of the Henry George School. She is a worthy pupil of that highly capable teacher. The others who reported the Congress for this issue are all members of the Students' Alumni.

At every recurring Henry George Congress Abe Waldauer asks us the question, "Will I see the Single Tax before I die?" And our answer has always been "Yes." As Abe seems rather anxious about it, and does not ask the question merely to keep in practise, we are going to predict publicly in anticipation of the same inquiry next year that he will live to see it.

It was good to meet old friends and a lot of new ones. The daughter of our old friend Charlie Fuller, Miss C. H. Fuller of Middletown, N. Y. especially interested us because we were a close friend of her father who passed away several years ago. She is an enthusiastic adherent of the Georgist philosophy.

Mayor McNair who has a habit of doing unexpected things, has offered our friend Abe D. Waldauer the office of City Attorney of Pittsburgh. We fancy that the people of Memphis think too much of him to let him go.

John Lawrence Monroe told of the progress of the Extension Classes on Thursday afternoon of the Congress. He said in part: "A year ago I completed a month's tour of the South and West. I visited Mississippi where Dr. Copeland carried on his heroic campaign. During my visit to many cities I saw that we were handicapped by the fact that only a few were familiar with our philosophy. In the Henry George School I discovered the method of bringing the sub-

ject to the people. In Cleveland Peter Witt gave a talk over the radio which elicited over 1,000 inquiries and resulted in the formation of classes in which 240 were enrolled. There are now over forty cities which have classes and these should reach 100 at the end of the year."

Young Billy Truehart of Houston, Texas, one of the most interesting figures at the Congress, showed a familiarity with our principles and a knowledge of "Progress and Poverty" remarkable in one so young.

Mr. M. Van Veen spent a whole day in showing Mrs. Truehart and Billy the sights of the city.

As a repercussion of the Tenth Henry George Congress the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh held a meeting to listen to reports of the Congress from Mayor McNair, Congressman Moritz, Robert C. Bowers, and Richard E. Howe.

Hon. George Foster Peabody, old friend of Lord Snowden, joined with Charles O'Connor Hennessy in a separate invitation to the former to attend the Congress. In another column will be found the admirable letter of Lord Snowden explaining why he was unable to be present.

We regret that Mr. J. B. Ellert, of Milk River, Alberta, did not give a full account of the experiment on Single Tax lines in that town. The Congress would have heard something constructive and inspiring. At the Henry George School on Monday, Sept. 30, he reviewed the history of what had been done in Milk River. It seems to us that here is a magazine story of unusual interest, which, with pictures of the town, would appeal to the editor of some popular periodical.

The success of the Congress was due not solely to its capable chairman Edward P. Donovan, but to the efficient cooperation of Mrs. B. W. Burger, Otto Dorn and John Lawrence Monroe. These persons deserve special mention.

P. R. Williams in his speech at the opening session said: "I cannot announce the discovery of any royal road to the triumph of our principles, but I do feel that we are making progress along many lines. Among these is the election of several of our believers to Congress. We have also found a new instrument in educational methods in the Henry George School."

Mr. Charles Erwood who reports the evening session of the first day of the Congress is librarian of the Henry George School, which is well on its way to the ownership of 5,000 volumes required as one of the conditions of the renewal of the School's charter two years from date.

We regret that Miss Helen D. Denbigh was not heard from. To her more than to any one is due the starting of the Henry George Fellowship. But readers of LAND AND FREEDOM will hear from her soon. In this connection it is pleasing to announce the receipt of Number One of *The Henry George Fellowship News* from Chicago.

Phelps Phelps, who has given some very interesting Henry George talks over the radio, but who says that he is not a Single Taxer, dropped in to look us over.

Ashley Mitchell of Huddersfield, England, whom many of our New York readers will remember, was unable to attend the Congress. He wrote: "I hope you will have a very successful Henry George Congress. Am delighted to know that Arthur Madsen and Mr. Folke are to be with you."

Albert Firmin, former postmaster of Brooklyn, held the attention of the audience with his resonant voice and his oratorical ability. Mr. Firmin is one of the best loved veterans of the movement.

We were glad to see our old friend "Larry" Henry at the Congress. He brought with him certain banners from the '86 campaign which were placed on display. Mr. Henry was accredited delegate to the Congress from his local union. He is 78 years of age but still full of enthusiasm for the cause.

The Importance of Free Trade

STEPHEN BELL AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS

IT is not my purpose to explain to you the merits of free trade, for you understand them as well as I do. It is unnecessary to tell you that Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade" is a classic, for you know that too. But it may be in order to remind some of you that the book is half a century old, that the tariff map of the world has changed considerably in that time, and the universality and stringency of trade strangulation today make the matter of commercial freedom more important than ever before. It is my desire to help you in visualizing the supreme importance of free trade in our larger philosophy of complete economic freedom.

Too many of us have taken at more than face value the dictum that advancing rent will absorb the gains that may result from free trade, even as it has absorbed the lion's share of the gains from other improvements and reforms.

Fifty years ago, when George wrote, Protectionism was in its infancy as compared with what it is today. It was merely an irritating, stinging sea nettle as compared with the giant octopus it is now, with its tentacles embracing the earth and strangling the trade of all nations, the trade that is the lifeblood of civilization, since without it civilization must languish and die.

Yet in 1888 Henry George thought the matter so important that he broke with many of his best and closest friends—even with that great soul whose memory we all delight to honor and revere, Father McGlynn, who was even then under the ban of excommunication by his church for having taken up the cross of this crusade,—in order to support Grover Cleveland for the Presidency on the mere chance that he might do something for free trade.

I would invite you to read again the concluding chapter of "Protection or Free Trade," you who regard tariffs as a side issue, and see for yourselves in the light of subsequent events the prophetic insight which inspired it.

I have said that Protectionism is strangling the trade that is the lifeblood of civilization. Why did Germany plunge the world into war? For a place in the sun. Free trade would have given it to her.

Why has Japan entered upon a career of expansion and conquest on the Asiatic mainland? For a place in the sun. Free trade would give it to her.

Why is Italy crying for more room and threatening the peace of the world? For a place in the sun which only free trade can give her.

Free trade, and only free trade, can give to every nation, great or small, rich or poor in natural resources, progressive or backward, its rightful place in the sun, opening to all of them all the resources of the earth through the channels of mutually profitable commerce.

I believe that Solomon had our philosophy of economic freedom in mind when he said:

"There is that scattereth and yet increaseth, and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it terdeth to poverty?"

Certain it is that the poverty of the world is due to its greed, the desire of the nations to keep their prosperity to themselves and to allow none of it to leak over their boundaries.

Too many of our people are afraid of the tariff question. I've heard them say they seldom or never start a discussion of the tariff because it seems to close the mind of the prospect to any discussion of the Georgian philosophy whatever. Well, it's just as easy to close the mind of a prospect by leading off with a discussion of the land question as it is with the tariff. My own experience is that the tariff offers one of the easiest and safest openings for a discussion of the broader philosophy of economic liberty which will give to all humanity its place in the sun by freeing all industry and trade from strangling restrictions and the burdens of taxation that should be borne by our real *commonwealth*, the values which populations and their activities create in the land.

Why do men fear that with free trade we would spend all our money abroad for cheap goods, and so allow our home industries to die? Do they not know that we can't spend American money abroad any more than foreigners can spend foreign moneys here?

Money is not migratory. It stays where it can circulate. Our merchants and manufacturers will not sell their goods abroad for foreign money. Foreign merchants and manufacturers will not sell their goods here for American money. Each wants the money of his own country. It is the function of exchange banking to be the medium through which exporters and importers exchange their credits, so that each can pay and be paid in the money he desires.

In normal times one may gauge the way in which the tides of trade are running by the movement of the foreign exchange market. Frank A. Vanderlip has called the exchange markets of the world the "international scale pans," and no more effective instrument exists for discouraging excessive importing or excessive exporting than the balance of the international scale pans, which, however, may be thrown out of balance when government credit in the form of great foreign loans are thrown into them.

Why cannot the so-called war debts of our associates

in the World War be paid? Because, while their moneys are worthless here, we prevent them from securing through trade the dollar credits necessary for their payment.

Why cannot the countries whose national and municipal governments and corporations borrowed large sums after the war for the rehabilitation of their industries, pay these debts, which amount to about as much as the war debts? The reason is the same.

You may wonder why and how those countries borrowed dollars, though dollars do not circulate abroad. They did not borrow them to take them abroad. They borrowed them to pay for American machinery, equipment, raw materials and foodstuffs, and it was for this purpose that the foreign governments threw their credit into the international scale pans. What we really loaned abroad was goods and services, and it is goods and services we must take in repayment, or let the debts go unpaid. In the face of this invincible fact, however, we have twice raised our tariff to prevent this kind of payment, and have even added insult to injury by calling our debtors "defaulters" and "welchers" for not paying.

It is the strain of trying to meet these commercial obligations with gold which has upset the gold standard itself, and this strain is an effective bar to currency stabilization.

Trade is a two-way traffic, and to stop it one way is to stop it both ways. We see its effects in the shrinking of agricultural products which began many years ago, backing these products up on a domestic market unable to absorb them until they smashed prices by their sheer weight. The foreigner could not buy here because we made it next to impossible for him to sell here. All this has helped immeasurably in breaking down the domestic market for manufactured goods of every description and scattering unemployment and destitution over this country and the world.

Now the primal motive for all trade is to acquire things we want and have not, and the thing we offer in exchange or sell in order to acquire the wherewithal to buy is merely the means by which we expect to get the thing we want. Let free trade liberate the consumer demand of the world if we truly desire to set the wheels of industry humming again.

Why are we trying to cure want in the midst of plenty by reducing the plenty? Because we refuse to liberate that consumer demand. These trade-strangling tariffs are costing the nations not only their prosperity, but their security and peace as well. Richard Cobden said of the anæmic half-baked free trade of the Manchester school that it was the *best* peacemaker. The late Henri Lambert of Belgium, who understood our brand of free trade, declared it to be the *only* peacemaker.

I have never known any other man whose mind worked so clearly and so independently along the lines blazed by Henry George as did the mind of this Belgian nobleman, who not only disdained the use of his title but was

suspect as a "defeatist" and "pro-German" during the war because of his clear diagnosis of the causes of the war and his insistence on their removal. He became intimate with Col. House, and to his influence I have attributed the third of President Wilson's famous "Fourteen Points" for settling the war—the one calling for the elimination of economic barriers. And I have attributed the break between President Wilson and Colonel House to the discarding of these Fourteen Points at the Versailles Peace Conference.

In my talks with Henri Lambert he disclosed a thorough understanding of the Georgean philosophy, but he maintained that George had unduly subordinated free trade in order to push the land question to the front, and he explained his attitude in this wise:

"The land question is basic, fundamental, and the popular mind, never profound, cannot be led to consider so fundamental a reform under conditions that exist today. War and the fear of war oppress the nations continually, and the hard conditions of life make it well-nigh impossible to think of anything else. Here in Europe the fear of war is always with us. No generation has escaped it. Our thoughts are centered on making our borders secure, to the exclusion of everything else. Therefore you will pardon me if I decline to be turned from my purpose of realizing for Europe a *Pax Economica*."

Henry George revealed to us the rock on which previous free trade philosophies had been wrecked, and we owe him eternal gratitude for showing to us the glories to which true free trade, or full economic freedom, will yet lead the world, but he overshot his mark when, without intending it, he allowed many of us to regard commercial freedom as a mere subordinate part of the broader philosophy.

In the work of the Henry George School of Social Science too much attention cannot be given to "Protection or Free Trade." George's book is a classic, but it is half a century old, and in that time trade strangulation has assumed forms and phases he little dreamed of.

Our great need is for a text book which, without omitting or altering any of the principles set forth by Henry George, shall bring this surpassingly important matter up to date.

SINGLE TAXERS will smile over a few words in Bernard Shaw's recent address to the left-wing Laborites in England. As reported in the *New York Times*, he said:

"They pay rent in Russia, but the difference is that here we pay rent to a gentleman who may go and blow it all at Monte Carlo. In Russia you pay rent to the local Soviet, which uses it for public purposes, of which you get the benefit. In other words, the people of London are fools; the people of Moscow are sensible."

Alice Stone in *Unity*.

Loyal Discipleship

SINGLE TAXERS, always optimistic and zealous, see a revival of interest in their movement in which they are attempting to enlist the interest of youth. At their tenth annual convention last week it was announced that the Henry George School of Social Science, established in New York three years ago, has branches in thirty-eight cities and it is hoped to increase the number soon to a hundred. They are taking advantage of current interest in economic problems to attract attention to this old proposal to cure the ills of society.

It is fifty-six years since George, a native Philadelphian, wrote "Progress and Poverty," and thirty-eight since his death. His book made him world famous. An enthusiastic Single Tax movement started in this country and rapidly gained adherents in England and the British dominions. In 1886 George, backed by labor in his candidacy for Mayor of New York City, ran ahead of Theodore Roosevelt, the Republican candidate, and gave Tammany a tight squeeze.

The Single Tax movement soon lost its first impetus and slowed down. It has always had devoted adherents preaching the George Gospel with almost religious fervor and setting an example to the advocates of other movements by their persistence. A real Single Taxer is never pessimistic, said one of the speakers at the New York gathering.—Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*.

A New Definition of Embezzlement

THE American Petroleum Industries Committee has long been complaining, with justice, of the disproportionate share of taxation to which the industry is subjected, as well as the many ways in which unscrupulous dealers evade these taxes, to the injury of their more honest fellows. It has followed up this noble work with one equally noble in intention but less so in conception. It would aid the government in preventing tax evasion while lightening the general burden, and would do it by means of a "model law" which it asks all the States to adopt.

We are particularly entranced with the one providing that failure to pay is to constitute an embezzlement of public funds. Thus the legitimate earnings of a gasoline dealer, or at least a portion of these earnings, are to be tagged as "public funds," to withhold which is a felony.

Of course this is done constantly by our tax laws without saying anything about it, but this express labeling private earnings as public funds invites inquiry as to what kind of funds the publicly created value or rent of land constitutes. No one pretends that this is even earned by the landowner.

Telegram From London

THE following telegram was received by Arthur Madsen and read at the Henry George Congress:

"Conference held under the auspices of City Council of Cardiff carried resolutions demanding power from Parliament to levy local taxes on land values. At conference there were ninety-six delegates, representing forty-four municipalities and other local governing bodies in Wales. Resolutions now being sent by Cardiff City Council to 2,000 municipalities and other local governing bodies in England and Wales."

A NIBBLE, ANYWAY

In Perigord, France, where they use pigs to root up truffles, it is found that unless the pigs get some of the truffles they stop digging.

Bureaucrats, tax collectors, please note that not even pigs will go on working if somebody takes away all that is dug.

London Express.

An Important Meeting In Los Angeles

THE opening speech of a movement to establish a unicameral legislative system in California was delivered at a recent Municipal League Forum in Los Angeles. The speaker was that veteran Democrat of Democrats and steadfast Georgist, Laurie J. Quinby of Hollywood. Mr. Quinby has never passed up an opportunity to promote true Democracy.

Over twenty years ago, as a Nebraska State Senator, he was criticized for promoting a constitutional amendment calling for a one-house legislature in that State. The next session of law makers in Nebraska will be unicameral.

Men of the Quinby calibre should be sent to California's State Capitol to replace the horde of blatant demagogues now there. And why not the "Sage of Hollywood" himself?—C. W. SILVERNALE.

IT was at the session on the Malthusian Theory at the Teachers' Training Class of the Henry George School of Social Science when one of the students referred to the fact that the population of the world could be housed in the State of Texas but the teacher understood him to say taxes in place of Texas. After the laughter subsided the teacher said: "Right, the population of the world could be housed in Texas and they could all be buried in taxes."

Contemplating the Here and Now

THE whole world seems at the present time experiencing a fearful unrest. The adjective "fearful" is not used inadvisedly. Many economic physicians are prescribing for the disease (lack of ease), but are apparently heeding symptoms only, and studiously avoiding causes. Several reasons may be attributable for this attitude. Symptoms are multitudinous and require little proof and less thought to declare, and one can, and most all of us do, see symptoms, while causes are few in number and may possibly be reduced to one outstanding fact which requires reason and logic to prove.

Mental laziness, then, has largely to do with a solution. Physicians who prescribe lake water with a Latin label are careful that their patients are kept ignorant of the subterfuge; likewise, there are many economic physicians, who know the truth, but are reluctant to advise the remedy openly, knowing that the world is apparently not yet ready to be free. To acquire freedom it becomes necessary to exert, at least in some degree, mental initiative.

It is a well-known fact that there are but two primal, fundamental factors in the human physical activities, namely, Man and the Earth. The question naturally arises, Does this generation possess sufficient knowledge and efficiency to extract from the earth their daily needs? "Give us this day our daily bread," has a deep significance when considering the apprehensions most of us entertain regarding the needs of tomorrow.

The fear of want is the compelling motive to store for future use and has been carried to excess by some, the gaining of which has kept them so occupied that their brother's needs have been entirely overlooked, together with that bit of philosophy which teaches that what rightly benefits one benefits all; also, the plan eventually spells failure and chaos—then change. The law of justice is always present and the necessity for making it manifest is gradually coming into the consciousness of the afore-said brother. Universal thought is today shaping itself on a new basis, which had best be recognized, and instead of being led into vague notions leaning toward socialistic doctrines, something along the line of fundamental Natural Laws will be considered. The trouble lies, of course, in the improper distribution of our wonderful gift of supply, and instead of permitting it to be monopolized by a few, we should reason that what is provided by the Creator without our aid or knowledge, must ostensibly have been intended for all. Placing our earth supply in the same category as the air and sunshine might aid us in this solution, and substituting superficial expediency for Natural Law with expectation of favorable results, promises to be a gigantic undertaking, involving untold ramifications.

Seeking every avenue for taxing labor products, and ignoring the scientific method of taxing the source, the monopoly of the earth, to the value of which all contribute, this reasoning, of course, is too simple for our experts to contemplate. It implies no statistical elaboration, historical data, nor prognostication anent the future; it merely contemplates the Here and Now. —F. J. EDDY.

GRUESOME stories of conditions in Russia appear in none too veracious Hearst papers. Whether true or false no denial by the Soviet government or its American champions can be trusted, since prohibition in Russia of hostile criticism constitutes an implied admission that the government has much evil to hide. The only way the Soviet administration can clear itself is by making hostile criticism as safe in Moscow as in Washington or New York. Until this is done communist speakers and writers must be classed as talking ignorantly or mendaciously.

IF the Wright brothers had needed an Act of Congress before they could have experimented with an airplane there would be no airplanes today. Had legislative permission been necessary before any one could try out an automobile we would still be in the horse and buggy age. Had Stephenson needed an Act of Parliament before being allowed to build a locomotive stage coaches would still be running. This explains why mechanical progress has outstripped progress in matters relating to government.

I AM glad to hear that you are engaged in an active campaign to make known the economic and fiscal ideas of Henry George. If the United States had hearkened to his warnings forty years ago it would have saved itself most of its present tribulations, so largely due to monopoly fostered by private control of land and natural resources. South Africa has the opportunity to avoid similar future catastrophe by adopting in time the principle that the land and its natural riches are not to be monopolized, but are for the good of all.

JOHN DEWEY, in letter to Mather Smith.

What They Are Saying

MEMORY OF HENRY GEORGE*

Labor Day, by a suggestive coincidence, occurred yesterday upon the birthday of Henry George, making the occasion doubly worthy of attention.

Henry George—born Sept. 2, 1839, died Oct. 29, 1897. His fundamental message remains today no less fresh and pertinent than it was nearly four decades ago when he laid down his sword!

The world he lived in was, for practical purposes, not so large as it is now, not so swift-moving, not so complicated. But it was a world of the same immemorial difficulty and struggle. Against the evils of that world he fought with a courage that never turned aside, and for its problems he offered a philosophy of justice which is still living.

"Social progress makes the well-being of all more and more the business of each," declared Henry George. The world has changed much since he said that, but the most idealistic of the New Dealers goes no further in stating his basic principles.

And to the timid souls who shake their heads at the idea of reform in the recovery programme there could be no better answer than Henry George's pronouncement, "There is danger in reckless change, but greater danger in blind conservatism."

Henry George was steadfastly the upholder of the rights of men who lived by their own hard work. He belonged also, and just as much, to all those patriots and visionaries who march toward the hope of a fairer deal.

The inspired *New York World* bade him farewell thirty-eight years ago in these words:—

"Wherever men honor public and private virtue; wherever men are struggling to uplift their fellow-men, wherever men grope in the darkness of oppression, straining their eyes for the breaking of the dawn of liberty, the news will come as the tidings of the death of a friend. . . . Liberty has lost a friend! Democracy has lost a leader! Down with dictators!"—*N. Y. World-Telegram*.

EDITORIAL NOTE: We are grateful for this fine tribute to our leader. But we must point out that there is *nothing* in common between the doctrines of the New Dealers and the "basic principles" of Henry George. Indeed they are in irreconcilable conflict.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM.

HENRY GEORGE IN CHINA

China would seem to be one of the world's poorest fields in which to disseminate the economic philosophy of Henry George. But Dr. Macklin didn't find it so.

During his four decades of service as a physician in a mission hospital, he found time to translate into Chinese Ida M. Tarbell's "History of the Standard Oil Company," Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics," Green's "Short History of English People," Henry George's famous works, "Progress and Poverty" and "Protection or Free Trade," and about fifteen other works along similar lines.

* * * *

In the course of his work in China, Dr. Macklin had opportunity to become closely acquainted with Dr. Sun Yat Sen, the George Washington of the Chinese Republic.

In their discussions concerning the future of China, Dr. Macklin

presented to the Chinese revolutionary leader the Henry Georgian philosophy of making taxes on socially created land values the sole source of governmental revenue, and converted him to the idea.

GILBERT BROWN, columnist, in *Los Angeles Post Record*.

LORD KITCHENER, GEORGIST

Kitchener's Georgist laws in Transvaal are the most dramatic part of his life, in their re-emergence. But one ventures to think the grandly simple lines of his Sudan Code will fructify in greater boons, which are the more impressive when we recall Cromer's founding of a landed gentry in Egypt itself at the time. Honor to our brother!

MERVYN J. STEWART in *Melbourne Progress*.

KITCHENER'S LAND REFORM PROGRAMME

When Lord Kitchener became Viceroy of Egypt he found a condition similar to that which now exists in the United States. He might have built more pyramids so as to give employment to labor, but he did not. He caused the distribution of small tracts of public land to the people and these tracts were inalienable. They could not be mortgaged or sold. The holder of this land could only desert it and make room for a better man.

PRESCOTT A. PARKER in *New York Herald-Tribune*.

ALWAYS ENOUGH IN THE WORLD FOR ALL

"The Chart of Plenty," which Charles A. Beard thinks is the most important American book published in recent years, proves, in the words of Stuart Chase's introduction, that under a different system of property relationships "American industry could supply every family with a health and decency budget (from \$2,000 to \$2,500) and give in addition almost as much again in terms of comforts." Although I am an amateur in these matters, I can find flaws in what Mr. Loeb and Mr. Chase have to say about the potential capacity of the industrial machine, and I hereby apologize for not having mentioned "The Chart of Plenty" before this.

But too much can be claimed for books like "The Chart of Plenty." As Murray Godwin once pointed out, there has always been enough in the world for every one. What has always kept most people from getting a good living is monopolization by an elite of land and natural resources, as Henry George long ago explained. "Progress and Poverty" is still a far more important book than "The Chart of Plenty." And the really important work of showing how the political means of distributing an annual income of some \$4,000 to each family is to be devised is as yet unwritten. Until that book appears I refuse to get excited about the figures of our technocratic prophets of the "economy of abundance." We have always had a potential plenty of basic stuffs, even if it takes the machine to offer us a potential plenty of luxuries.—JOHN CHAMBERLAIN in *New York Times*.

FRIEND OF CAPITAL AS WELL AS THE FRIEND OF LABOR

The only reformer abroad in the world in my time who interested me in the least was Henry George, because his project did not contemplate prescription, but, on the contrary, would reduce it almost to zero. He was the only one of the lot who believed in freedom, or (as far as I could see) had any approximation to an intelligent idea of what freedom is, and of the economic prerequisites to attaining it.

* * * *

One is immensely tickled to see how things are coming out nowadays with reference to his doctrine, for George was in fact the best friend the capitalist ever had. He built up the most complete and absolutely impregnable defense of the right of capital that was ever constructed.—ALBERT J. NOCK in *July Atlantic*.

HENRY GEORGE IDEAS APPROVED IN SO. AFRICA

The May issue of the monthly journal, the *Industries of South*

Africa, published in Durban, contains a complete reprint of Henry George's "The Crime of Poverty."

An editorial note said "the arguments propounded by the Prophet of San Francisco, are arguments that apply even more forcibly to present day world conditions."

"Those of our readers who will read deeply and study carefully what Henry George has to say will find to their amazement that what he says is so right—so utterly and simply right—that the fundamental facts seem to have escaped more recent reformers of our social and economic systems in their seeking after complicated methods to right complicated wrongs."

Land and Liberty, London, England.

SPENDING LIKE A DRUNKEN SAILOR

\$24,206,533,000, representing the expenditure of Roosevelt's Administration, as estimated by the President—actual 1934 and estimated 1935 and 1936, a total of three years—means that the New Dealers are spending the taxpayers' money at the rate of \$15,351 per minute, or \$255 per second. That's something for our boys and girls of today—our taxpayers of the future—to look forward to!

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

A DEFINITION OF PRIVILEGE

In my thinking, privilege has to do with a favored position that enables a person to secure income at the expense of others, income for which he does not render an equivalent in goods or services to those from whom this income is drawn. The income of a monopolist, of a slave owner (even though he has bought his slaves from the previous owners), of a recipient of tariff or other government favors, and of a person whose income is derived mainly from the community-produced situation rent of land or sites, might all be spoken of as enjoying privileged income.

PROF. HARRY GUNNISON BROWN, in *St. Louis Star Times*.

WILL CANADIAN LABOR ACT ON ITS OWN RESOLUTION?

The All-Canadian Congress of Labor, at its annual convention in Montreal in May last, adopted certain "recommendations of policy" made by its Executive Board. Among these was one on the subject of *The Land*, reading as follows:

"The nation should re-assert the ownership of natural resources as an initial step in any fundamental reform of the economic system. The most important of all natural resources, the land, should be national property. The communally created value of land should belong to the community. To achieve this advance the Board recommends the advocacy of the gradual acquisition of all land values by taxation, the revenue so derived being applied first for the provision of housing for the workers."

This is the deliberately chosen policy of the Congress and it stands as such until—if ever—it is altered or rescinded by equally authoritative action of some future convention.

On the other hand, natural resources actually have been made private property to such an extent that the workers have been deprived of their fair share. This has been done throughout our civilization and in all ages of recorded history. This fact is about as obvious and as widely known as man's constant dependence upon natural resources. Not only that, but in all ages and all lands there have been protests against such a system. But those protests have been made, almost without exception, against some special grievance or to ward off some evil threatening the common welfare. The case that comes most readily to mind is that long-continued and systematic outrage by which the common lands of England were "enclosed" with the intent and effect of stealing them from the communities that owned them.

Has anything happened here in Canada to make it necessary for Labor to make a gesture of warning or protest? Many will say that things are going along just as they have always gone along and that

the All-Canadian Congress of Labor in adopting this "land" resolution is merely repeating a platitude or is looking for trouble.

A. C. CAMPBELL, in *Canadian Unionist*.

QUESTIONS OUR OPPONENTS MUST CONFUTE

To shatter Georgian economics it is only necessary to refute certain very simple propositions which Henry George propounds, illustrates and proves. Such propositions for example are:—

1. That man is entirely dependent upon land for his physical existence.
2. That this planet (land) is the gift of the Creator to all his creatures—not merely to the dress circle occupiers.
3. That the only real Landowner, the Creator, charges no Rent or the use of his land.
4. That rent only exists where human societies exist.
5. That at the fringes of society (if land be plentiful and not purposely held out of use) there will be no Rent.
6. That Rent is a natural phenomenon—as natural as any physical law—secreted as it were *only* by society, just as food is naturally secreted by the mother for the benefit of her young.
7. That land is the only source of wealth, and labor the only means by which wealth is produced.
8. That all taxation is a forcible extraction from the wages of labor.
9. That Rent is not an extraction from wages.
10. That Rent correctly applied to meet the expenses of government, eliminates the necessity for taxation, and thereby assures to labor the full value of the products produced.
11. That *wages* are the returns to labor, whilst Rent is the natural return due to society, being occasioned and caused by society as distinct from the individual.
12. That labor applied to land produces wealth.
13. That mere ownership of land contributes nothing to the production of wealth, though it often yields fortunes to owners.

The Standard, Sydney, Australia.

TAKE TAXES OUT OF PRICES

The Wall Street Journal has been harping on "Kept Apart by Price" for about a year now, and I hope that it continues harping on that same theme. Neither government nor legislation has any direct jurisdiction in the field of price fixing, for anything, and that includes wages, interest, rent and profits, but can control taxes and the expense of governmental activities. Legislators can "Take Taxes Out of Prices" by shifting them to the site value of land. They can cancel taxes with rent and they should do it now. That can and should be done gradually, one step at a time. The best place to start, I think, would be transportation taxes. That is the heaviest tax that everybody has to pay. By shifting ALL taxes from ALL carrier facilities, including gasoline, coal and oil, to ALL land values, urban and rural, irrespective of ALL improvements, would be killing, with one stone, two foul birds of prey, namely, exorbitant freight and passenger rates and fabulously high prices and rents for land, particularly in our larger cities. Legislators should learn about and become conscious of the limitations of statutes and, at the same time, put aside wishful thinking and wish-fulfilment devices and do things that are possible and which should be done in the public interest.

DR. C. J. LAVERY in *Dakota Free Press*.

THANKS, BROTHER TOEPFERT

It surely is becoming evident that a right solution of our tax problems is of the utmost concern, as you have said, in the affairs of every United States citizen. The modern development of the doctrines of Smith, Spencer, the French physiocrats and others of the "classic" period are carried out and elaborated in the teachings of Henry George, and in this connection it may be of interest to know that the Henry George School of Social Science, located in New York City

and chartered under the laws of the State, is establishing extension schools in the principal cities of the United States.

OSCAR A. TOEPFERT in *Christian Science Monitor*.

REAL ESTATE RACKETS

The field of real estate rackets has experienced a depression boom. . . . aimed at those who want to sell—debt-ridden suburbanites, harassed farmers, bedeviled merchants, bewildered widows. . . . "Cash for your home," "We buy real estate anywhere," or "Mortgage money available." . . . Rented desk room—"business address," cards printed: "Real estate appraisals." The stage was set for the ads in the "Money to loan" sections. "Advance fee" racket. "I've a client who wants to buy your place." . . . contract of sale . . . etc., etc. . . . "Building Corporation" represented as being very, very anxious to buy these tracts. . . . Payment . . . no cash but only interest-bearing mortgages, the terms of which the promoters had no intention of meeting. . . . they had accomplished their purpose, the collection of the advance fee, and had kept *within the law*.

The many Philadelphians who succumbed to the scheme didn't know that the lots for which they paid \$1,500 each—a large part in cash—had cost the promoters only \$75. each. This game is worked all over the country.

Free Lot scheme, and Lunch and Lecture scheme. "Once signed these contracts hold." Don't count too heavily on the law.

JEROME ELLISON in *Readers Digest* for August.

BOOK REVIEWS

A USEFUL BOOK—WITHIN LIMITS*

Here is a work typical of much that is being written in these days, and useful within limits.

Prof. Wallis has his fling at Henry George. It has become the habit of those who derive all they know from the master to present what they want to think is an original approach to the problem, so much more reasonable than Henry George himself, but which turns out to be the same thing under another name and a new setting, or some very much diluted form of it. For example, one of the subtitles of this work is "A New Approach to the Business Problem." It would be new if Henry George had not indicated the same avenue of approach fifty-five years ago. We wonder if it is just crass egotism that leads these writers to wrest piecemeal rocks from the great mountain and exhibit them as original discoveries. There is not a single statement in this book of Prof. Wallis that is not derived from "Progress and Poverty."

Perhaps the reader will ask for justification for these comments of the reviewer. We have it on page 58 and 59 of the work as follows:

"Mr. George, as we have shown, was not the first writer who pointed to land as a peculiar tax base; but he attracted worldwide attention for a time by linking economics, in oracular style, with utopian emphasis on Single Tax as a panacea for social ills. * * * I concur in much that Mr. George says, but cannot count myself a disciple, and have experienced considerable difficulty in working with those who regard him as their master."

On the whole, then, the influence of "Progress and Poverty" at the present time is an obstacle in the way of sane economic readjustment; and with regard to this point, the views of many scholars are expressed by Prof. Edward A. Ross, of Wisconsin University, who writes me as follows: "I agree with you that by rearing a Utopia on the exclusive taxation of land, Henry George interrupted the rational evolution which was getting on toward recognizing land as peculiarly able to bear taxation."

This is pretty astonishing. Mr. George did much more than point to land as a peculiar tax base. Nor did he set himself to build a Utopia. If he dwelt upon the subject "in oracular style" (by the way, this sounds like a sneer) he did so because he saw the kind of a civilization that would result from the solution he offered. He had linked the law of wages with the law of rent. This was his great contribution to economic science. There had been many land re-

formers before him, but none had built the bridge over which in a much feebler way inferior thinkers had stumbled, or walked uncertainly. It is not surprising that Prof. Wallis found "considerable difficulty in working with those who regarded Henry George as their master." It is clear that he has only imperfectly sensed the teachings of Henry George in all their implications.

We are sad to learn that "Progress and Poverty" is "an obstacle in the way of sane economic readjustment." The remark is amusing, for it is doubtful indeed if Mr. Wallis' present volume would have emerged at all if Henry George had not inspired it.

But let us be grateful for small things. This book will be read by many who have not the intellectual capacity, nor perhaps the leisure, to examine what Henry George really taught. Much that precedes what we have quoted is well worth while. In this we include his examination of Marx, his explanation of the nature of capital, his relation of land to production, and the evils wrought by land speculation. These are all well done, and other comments of Prof. Wallis call for commendation.

Prof. Wallis suggests as a substitute for the name Single Tax, "Capretax," which strikes us as a name of equal futility.

It may be said, too, that the rejection of rights, or "Natural rights," on which George laid peculiar emphasis, forces Prof. Wallis to an acceptance of Bentham's principle of "The greatest good to the greatest number," the fallacy of which was pointed out by the clear-eyed Alexander H. Stephens many years ago.

All the points raised quite admirably by Prof. Wallis will find further augmentation in a better knowledge of Henry George, to whom all these arguments may be traced. And for the benefit of the student let us say that Henry George did not teach that land was "peculiarly able to bear taxation." It is not the taxation of land that he taught, and we wonder if it would not have been just as well to insist upon this throughout in the interest of truth and a better understanding. Indeed this has been done in what precedes the passage we have quoted and which is a negation of what has gone before.

All in all, it will still have to be said that this little work will do good among those who prefer to get their knowledge in derivative form.

J. D. M.

*"Safeguard Productive Capital. Tax Ground Values and Untax Industry." By Louis Wallis. 12mo. Doubleday, Doran, Garden City, N. Y.

PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

"Social Democracy" is the title of a twelve page pamphlet issued by the Order of Social Democracy of Georgia. It is signed by Howell Clopton Harris as secretary and he is presumably the author of this little work stating the aims and principles of the order.

The recommendations include political as well as economic changes. Of course, the collection of land values, or economic rent for public purposes, forms the first of these demands. We might be critical of some of the suggestions, but Mr. Harris is too good a Democrat to insist that his demands (in this instance the demands of the Order of Social Democracy of Georgia) are the last words of wisdom on the subject.

It should be said that on the fundamentals of economics Mr. Harris stands "four square." Wage and price-fixing, regimentation, tariffs, etc., are rejected for reasons that have been tested by experience. Certainly no party will go to the polls with a better programme than the Order of Social Democracy.

* * *

"A Printer Tells the President," is a pamphlet of 32 pages by H. Ellenoff, consisting of questions and answers. This compact little arsenal of fact and reason is published by the author at 916 Carroll Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. at twenty-five cents a copy. The number of questions are forty-five and the answers include figures and statistics, with statement of authorities from many and varied sources.

We have no hesitation in saying that of all the pamphlets that have reached this office in a long period this is the most admirable and weighty. The answers to some of the President's statements are keen and searching. We cannot refrain from this single quotation "When man is denied his natural rights, the common reaction of governments the world over is to take on the functions not originally intended, such as prying into private affairs, the creation of jobs the exalted idea that it is the duty of government to make people happy. Man who is the product, the result of countless ages of evolution, can well take care of himself, provided he has free access to nature."

Perhaps because this little pamphlet is issued by an advertising man its typographical appearance is peculiarly appealing.

* * * * *

Donald L. Thompson, of Spokane, Wash., is the author of a number of thoughtful pamphlets. The one before us is captioned "Our Deluded Over-Productionists" and is sold for fifteen cents a copy. It is written simply and is a sufficient answer to those who would reduce crops and limit production. The doctrine Mr. Thompson attacks and which is widespread he calls "an economic illusion," and proves it to any one who can be induced to peruse this easily read and easily understood little brochure.

* * * * *

Here is another larger pamphlet which we heartily recommend though it is quite different from the three that have been noted in the foregoing. It is entitled "America's Tax Dilemma" and is published and presumably written by Herbert Atkinson, 148 Eighth Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. It consists of 48 pages and can be had for 25 cents a copy.—J. D. M.

Correspondence

NOTICE TO OUR CORRESPONDENTS

With this number we bring to an end, so far as these columns are concerned, the controversy on Interest, whether Rent enters into Price, or whether under the full collection of Economic Rent any of the selling price of land remains.

The world is approaching a tragic hour. We are trembling on the brink of another World War. Whatever the outcome of the Italian Ethiopian squabble the danger is still upon us.

We are bringers of a World Peace. Our gospel is the gospel of plenty, of liberty throughout the world. We bring a message that will make war forever impossible. We preach the concord of nations the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man. And we know how to attain that condition. The future is ours if we will but obey the call.

Let us pray that it may not be too late. In the meantime the clouds are gathering. Civilization, such as it is, cannot survive a recurrence of what came upon us in 1914. Henry George has given us a great message, a message of emancipation from the terrors that are threatening, the dangers in which no household is safe, the loss of all that is generous and fine, the destruction of the culture and beauty that have taken centuries to build.

What shall be said of those of us who at such a time stop to discuss whether rent enters into price, or whether under the full collection of economic rent more or less shall be asked for the use of capital. Whether one or other of these schools be right matters but little. Our duty and responsibility are greater than these.

Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

CONDITIONS IN KOREA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In the July number of *Asia* there appeared an article on Korea under twenty-five years of Japanese control. It is entitled "Japan

d the Korcan Farmer." The author is C. Martin Wilbur. Accord- to *Asia* Mr. Wilbur has lived in Japan, China and Korea since the e of one, and was Reference Librarian at the College of Chinese udies in Peiping during 1932-1934. Accordingly he should know e subject. It is quite evident that he knows the facts, but as to the ical relation of cause and effect he is utterly at sea.

He points out the terrible condition of the Korean farmer after quarter of a century of guidance from the Yankees of the East. or instance: fifty-three per cent of the farmers are tenants. The erage yearly income of tenant farmers after rent is paid, amounts the equivalent of \$15.80, or about seventy-five per cent of what is ecessary to support life by the lowest standard prevalent in Korea, twenty-five per cent below the cost of living. Rents equal from ty to eighty per cent of the harvest. In addition to this the tenant ys the land tax, and also gives presents in feudal fashion to the ndlord and his family. More and more farmers are becoming nants each year, going from bad to worse, and Japanese and city reans are getting possession of the ancestral acres. On top of this ave the astounding fact of an increase of over one hundred per nt in rice production, due to more efficient methods of farming. ill seventy-four per cent of the entire population are in decline in eonomic way.

To what does Mr. Wilbur attribute this depression of Korea? He ames it upon the fecundity of the Koreans! He asserts that in enty-three years these improvident people have had the audacity ncrease in number fifty-three per cent! Think of it! While the ff of life has increased one hundred per cent in twenty-five years, gestive systems to handle that rice have increased but one-half! nd in consequence three-quarters of the population are worse off an they were under the petrified civilization of the Hermit King- om twenty-five years ago. And yet Mr. Wilbur knows that the ndlords get from fifty to eighty per cent of the Korean farmer's oduct of his labor in rent, and give in return absolutely nothing. nd does Mr. Wilbur believe that if the population had increased at one-quarter or had even remained static, or declined, that the of the farmer would be any better when fifty per cent to eighty r cent of his labor is lost to a parasite?

I have written to the editors of *Asia* showing the fallacy in Mr. ilbur's reasoning, and pointing out the true cause, and they have tified me that they are interested in my conclusions and are sending y letter to Mr. Wilbur so that he may reply to it himself. ooklyn, N. Y.

JOHN LUXTON.

WE THINK MR. LOOMIS IS IN ERROR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

My main contention in the discussion in which I have been taking rt is that under the full Single Tax it is quite possible that land ll have a genuine selling value. May I be allowed just a little more nce?

If the landowner received only WAGES for the collection of taxes m sub-tenants or for other actual work, his retention of part of the nt would not show itself in a selling value of the land. I personally elieve it will pay the State to allow him more than this, to allow m enough to give the land an acutal selling value. How else will e State attain the objective referred to by Henry George of "avoid- g the attempt to rent land through State agency?" This can be mplished only by having land bought and sold as it is now. And r this purpose land must have a real selling value.

It is true that the State will get a service. I believe it will get it eaper thus than in any other way. But it will get it by allowing nd to have a selling value. On the other hand, the landowner will et get something for nothing, for the portion of the rent that he gets r this will tend to equal the interest on his investment.

I return now to my main contention, that it is quite possible for nd to have a selling value under the full Sngle Tax.

Chicago, Ill.

H. B. LOOMIS.

NOTE—The selling value of land is an untaxed value. If there-

fore any selling value of land remains after we get the Single Tax it is proof we have fallen short of our purpose and that something is still due the community.

A typographical error crept into John Luxton's reply to Mr. Loomis on page 132 of the July-August issue, second column, 8th line. It should read one hundred per cent minus X per cent, *not plus*.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

TOUCHES A PROFOUNDER QUESTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

May I add a few words to the memorial article on "The Passing of Frank Stephens" and of his views which may not be known to all of his friends.

His mother designed him for the ministry but due to theological differences he did not enter it. The only person with him to the last was the beloved nurse, Mrs. Marguerite Shanklin Wood, who has ministered to so many people in Arden.

Frank Stephens view of life was always intensely ethical and doubt- less he took death in the stride. His service to ethical issues was marked—the popular nickname for him was "The Pope." His motto was action.

Perhaps religion will make no real advance until we so far progress as to have bona fide communication with those who have passed on. Advances in religion have always taken place with uphill effort against the opposition of cotemporary theology. Ignorance in official religions have retarded spiritual progress.

Lonsdale, R. I.

FLORENCE GARVIN.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANK STEPHENS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

A severe illness, which has kept me flat on my back for months, and from which I have not yet recovered, has delayed my tribute to Frank Stephens.

He was one of the whitest souls ever created and spent his life in unselfish devotion to his fellows.

In 1884 Frank Stephens, A. H. Stephenson, A. N. Chandler, R. L. Atkinson and Will Atkinson formed the Henry George Club of Phila- delphia.

Stephenson was a very able speaker and debater, but exulted in making mince meat of those he met in debate and Stephen's time was largely taken up by trying to heal the wounds made by Stephenson.

When I started *Justice*, a Single Tax weekly, Stephens, Stephenson and Chandler were all associate editors.

That the Club was a vital force in the Single Tax movement for many years was very largely due to Frank Stephens.

Frank was staying at the Union Square Hotel and was the first to respond to Mrs. Henry George's call for help when Mr. George died.

I had gone that night to the George home at Fort Hamilton, at Henry George's request, to escort Anna George home. She had been at Father Ducey's meeting at Cooper Union at which he came out flatly for Henry George.

Capon Springs, Va.

WILL ATKINSON.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

RABBI MICHAEL AARONSOHN writes: "I have been keenly interested in Frank Chodorov's article in May-June issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, 'Wanted One Thousand Teachers.'"

DR. ADOLPH DAMASCHKE, leading land reformer of Germany, died July 31. He differed from Henry George in his teachings. He was the editor of the "Year Book of Land Reform and Social Questions," and founder of the Society for German Land Reform. In June, 1931, he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize won that year by Eric Karefeldt, Swedish poet, and in 1919 and 1920 he was urged as a candidate for President of Germany. His published works are

numerous, among them being "The Problem of Communal Politics," "History of Political Economy," "History of the German Land Reform Movement," "The Art of Popular Speaking in Public," and many others. He assisted in the preparation of the Special Number of the *Single Tax Review* for Germany in 1912, an eighty-page illustrated number, one thousand copies of which were sent to Germany for distribution. It was not foreseen that two years later Germany and the world would be involved in the chaos of a great war. It is conceivable that events might have worked out very differently if the war had not intervened. The organization for land reform which he had founded and of which he was the head, came to naught on Hitler's ascent to power. Dr. Damaschke had married in 1904 Julia Geiser, daughter of a Jena professor, and three daughters were born of this union. A fuller account of his life and work appears in the "Single Tax Year Book" (1917) edited by Joseph Dana Miller and will be found on page 145 of that work from the pen of Joseph Danziger.

WE have received a letter from the secretary of Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It will be recalled that Frank Stephens dined at the White House at the invitation of Mrs. Roosevelt a few weeks before his sudden death. The letter reads as follows: "Mrs. Roosevelt asks me to thank you for the copy of *LAND AND FREEDOM* containing the article about Frank Stephens. She is very glad to have this and deeply appreciates your sending it to her."

ARTHUR W. ROEBUCK, Ontario's Attorney General, and long a Henry George man, in a recent address to more than 4,000 delegates of the Knights of the Khorassan, said: "I would like to see the day when there will be no one at the border going through our baggage looking for things which should not be there."

WE have received the September number of the *Roman Forum*. It is full of interesting matter and its discussion of current events is as usual wonderfully informative. The paper is published at one dollar a year and is well worth the subscription price. The *Roman Forum* edited by Dr. Frederick W. Roman is published at 214 Loma Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

DURING the Pittsburgh Jubilee held Aug. 19 to 24, Mr. John C. Rose had charge of the distribution of literature at the Assessors' booth. During the week he distributed all the good literature they had in Pittsburgh. Francis Maguire gave out literally tons of the literature remaining from the Joseph Fels Fund stock. During the Jubilee week one hundred and thirty persons were enrolled in the Henry George School of Social Science.

The Universal Engineer is an imposing monthly periodical of over 70 pages published at 150 Nassau Street and devoted to engineering. In the September number appears the address of John H. Allen on "Taxation" delivered before the Universal Craftsmen Council of Engineers. It is an uncompromising presentation of our philosophy. On another page appear carefully selected paragraphs from the work of J. P. Kohler, "Hard Times," which our readers need not be told are all that can be desired. These are arranged by Mr. Allen who asks: "Because our great grandfathers, our grandfathers, yes, our own fathers, have been content to struggle along under these ever-recurring depression-boom cycles is surely no reason why we should not correct the evil, in our own generation." Our congratulations to the publishers of this impressive periodical.

JOHN T. GIDDINGS of East Providence, R. I. appears with a number of Single Tax communications in the columns of the *Providence Journal* and the *Evening Bulletin*.

WE learn from Judge A. B. Pittman of Memphis, of the death of our old friend Louis N. Geldert, of a sudden heart attack. Mr.

Geldert was not a Single Taxer but he was a personal friend of the editor of *LAND AND FREEDOM* and a man of high character. When we were in Memphis on the occasion of the Henry George Congress he gave a luncheon in our honor and invited a number of his friends prominent in the city, among whom was Judge Pittman, the charming editor of the *Press Scimitar*, and the leading Unitarian clergyman of Memphis. He drove us around the city with Mrs. Geldert who passed away several months ago. She was a writer of distinction. We shall cherish the recollection of these two charming people who have passed from among us. Mr. Geldert was editor of the *Cotton Oil Press* and a personal friend of Herbert Hoover.

PERCY R. MEGGY of New South Wales is dead at 82. The *Standard* of Sydney gives a sketch of his life and his great services to the cause. He was indefatigable in his work for the movement and his article appeared in many periodicals. He was special correspondent of *LAND AND FREEDOM* for Australia. A newspaper man all his life he helped to found the *Chicago Daily News* during his stay in the United States and later was on the staff of the *London Echo*. He also did much work for the Australian papers. The *Standard* tells us that his end was peaceful. A long and useful life is closed. Three daughters and a son survive him. Two sons were killed in the World War.

An article in *Harpers* for August by Wayne W. Parish and Harold F. Clark, contains the following: "It is quite true that the quantity of land is fixed, but this is no longer suitable as a basis for economic theory. Production in the future will have little relation whatever to land itself." Comment is superfluous.

OUR old friend Rev. John F. Scott now resides at 1101 Atchison Street, Pasadena, Calif. He writes that he has been "crashing into the papers of late." He was present at a reception given by Mr. and Mrs. Lee to Mrs. Anna George de Mille within a few miles of his home. Mr. Scott writes in a letter full of his old humor. "I enjoyed it—all of which I saw and part of which I was."

L. C. PAINTER is a candidate for State Senator from Alexandria, Va. We quote from his platform:

Democracy is impossible with a vicious system of taxation. To restore prosperity; lower assessments against the farmer, merchant, mechanic, businessman, home owner, and raise them upon the valuable, idle, city and suburban land, and valuable merchandising land until they equal its rental value. Charging this valuable land full value for services rendered, would prevent land speculation, untangle industry, and remove its shackles. Both would encourage industry. Virginia can break this depression immediately by adopting such a system. Every other State would have to follow suit to prevent a flight of their capital and labor from moving into Virginia.

THE death of Mrs. Isabel deForest Colbron at an advanced age is announced. She was the mother of Grace Isabel Colbron and died at New Canaan, which had been her home for a number of years.

WE regret to chronicle the death of Mrs. Julia Goldzier in an automobile accident. She will be remembered as the author of the "At-one-ment of Single Tax and Christian Science." She knew her economics as well as she knew her Christian Science, though she had her differences with Mrs. Eddy.

EDWIN J. JONES of Westfield, N. J. writes:

The Single Taxer fully grounded in the faith has nothing but scorn and disgust for the corrupting and demoralizing methods of propaganda now being so mercilessly exposed in investigations at Washington. This crafty manner of warping the judgment of the citizen taxpayer and voter never can succeed because such is the power of truth that once the light of day is brought to bear upon the propagandists the exposure brings their work to naught. There is, therefore, no excuse for George adherents for deciding on the adoption of any but the strictest adherence to the truth as they have absorbed it from Henry George.

OUR old friend Frank G. Anderson has a Single Tax article of a plumn in *Skandia*, Swedish newspaper of Jamestown, N. Y. Brother Anderson was 78 on Oct. 5 and has been active in the movement since 1886.

MORRIS VAN VEEN of this city recently bought in a second hand bookstore a copy of "Progress and Poverty" (Appleton edition, 382.) In it is a book plate of Frederick Leveson Gower, and neatly added in the book are numbered columns from the *London Times* of the excellent review of "Progress and Poverty" which appeared in the "Thunderer" of Sept. 14, 1882. Now is it a matter of record, and do any of our English friends know, if Mr. Gower was the author of that review so admirably done?

WE regret that in the review of Jorgensen's "Stagnation of Industry" in July-August LAND AND FREEDOM from the pen of Norman B. Fowles the name of the publisher was omitted. The work is issued from the publishing house of James Bell Company, Elkhart, Ind., and its price is \$2.00.

A RECENT visitor to this office was Father J. H. Higgins of Wellington, New Zealand, a convinced Henry George man and a charming personality. He will see Father Coughlin while here. He is now on his way to Washington, D. C. On his return he will get in touch with representatives of the movement here.

DR. ROYAL S. HAYES of Waterbury, Conn., sent a copy of "Progress and Poverty" to a friend, Dr. Dayton R. Pulford, of Toledo, who wrote Dr. Hayes as follows:

George appeals to me, for he goes to fundamentals and then builds, and does it step by step. He makes his premises so obvious and unalterable that one cannot help being impressed by their truth. He is so unlike the windy economists that clutter up the press. One thing, thank God, he does not decorate his book with charts and graphs. I always think of Roger Babson with his goatee and charts when I think of economics. Most of those damned economists have an axe to grind and hide their whetstone behind a gas barrage. I cannot help too about thinking of that Yale economist who thought prohibition was pulling us out of the depths of poverty and then we had to vote back liquor to get us out again.

FOXHALL A. PARKER of Salisbury, Md., has just returned from the International Lions' convention in Mexico City. An address was delivered by Lic Emilio Portes Gill, president of the National Political Party, and former president of Mexico, in which he advocated a policy of land restoration for Mexico. Mr. Parker asked him through an interpreter if he was familiar with the teachings of Henry George and he told him that he was not only familiar with them but very much interested. Mr. Parker also met and interviewed Senator Lic Moises Huerta and Mr. Richard Pesquera of Mexico City.

AN admirable letter which we have not the space to reprint appears in the *Philadelphia Evening Ledger* from the pen of Harold Sudell. He will send a hundred copies of this letter with a copy of the "Single Tax, What It Is and Why We Urge It" by Henry George, to as many persons as may be interested.

JAMES W. GERARD, former Minister to Germany, advocates a tax on spending abroad. We suggest that such a measure should be entitled, "A Bill to Reduce Employment at Sea, from Captain to taker."

THE *Wilmington News* as well as *Every Evening* of the same city contained detailed reports of the celebration at Arden, Del., in August. The latter contained an excellent article from its special writer William P. Frank, in which is an interesting story of the Delaware campaign.

HON. HUGH PATERSON, member of Congress from the first Georgia

district, writes as follows to E. B. Gaston of the *Fairhope Courier*: "I am especially interested to get your views regarding the Single Tax. I have studied the Single Tax rather thoroughly and I am heartily in accord with the economic theories of Henry George." Page Howell Clopton Harris of Cordele, Ga.

WE regret to announce the death of Judge R. B. Minor of San Antonio, Texas, long an advocate of the Henry George philosophy and for many years a friend of LAND AND FREEDOM.

THE *New York Sun* has been very generous of late in its publication of Single Tax letters. These have included communications from John Luxton, Edwin J. Jones, Raymond V. McNally and others.

EUGENE W. WAY, of Seattle, Wash., suggests the reprinting in pamphlet form of Rabbi Aaronsohn's admirable address before the 37th Division of the A. E. F. He offers to take one hundred copies. If contributions are available we will undertake it.

COLONEL WILLIAM C. HARLLEE, who retired from the Marine Corps on July 1, after 35 years of service, announces that he will be a candidate for the United States Senate from South Carolina in the 1936 primaries. Col. Harllee is well known to the friends of the Henry George movement and is a fundamental Democrat. In a statement published in the Dillon, (S. C.) *Herald*, he says: "I am a Democrat devoted to the pioneer leaders of American democracy who proclaimed the majesty of all men and that the best government is the kind which governs least. Prosperity is not coming to this country by levying sales, excises or nuisance taxes, and borrowing money from bankers and paying them a tribute in interest and then squandering it all in priming the pump of business * * * or handing it over to the shipping or other interests." The statement of Col. Harllee is published also in the Columbus, (S. C.) *State* and furnishes an admirable declaration of principles for his campaign. In a letter to the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM he says: "This State still clings to the democracy of Jefferson. The tide has turned against the New Dealers who seek to destroy the principles for which our people have struggled. I shall follow the kind of democracy we believe in and shall be guided by the beacon lights that mark the course." Col. Harllee thinks the prospects are encouraging.

Two statements appear in a recent issue of the *Nation*. One is as follows: "Proponents of the abolition of capital punishment sometimes seem as tiresome as Single Taxers." On another page of the same issue the *Nation* says: "The idiocy of poverty in the midst of plenty has often been pointed out." Our friend E. W. Doty of Cleveland writes to the *Nation*: "Do these two sentences by any chance emanate from the same writer. And just when did the *Nation* offer any remedy for idiocy of poverty, except Socialism, trades unionism, Wagner bills, and Section 7 a?"

THE Revere (Mass.) *Journal* of July 11 contained an article by Leslie Eichel, Times Central Press Staff Writer, dated at New York, headed "Single Taxers Attack F. D. R. Tax Proposals." W. L. Crosman of Revere augmented this with a letter in the next issue of the *Journal*. We may say that Mr. Eichel's syndicated letter appeared in a number of papers. He is doing good work for us.

FLORENCE GARVIN writes: "I am glad to see in the current issue of LAND AND FREEDOM that the New York Constitution, Article I. Section 10, states that the people in their right of sovereignty are deemed to possess the original and ultimate property to all lands within the jurisdiction of the State." This would enable the State to commandeer all lands without compensation to the owners. My father, Governor Garvin of Rhode Island, was accustomed to ask if the government compensated the heirs who would compensate the disinherited?"