

March—April, 1939

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE-TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Public Education as a Course of Social Action

Will Lissner

Federal Housing

Jos. Hiram Newman

The Last Depression

Leslie Picot

Work of the Schalkenbach Foundation

V. G. Peterson

Book Reviews---Autobiography of Richard T. Ely

Robert Clancy

Pamphlets Received—Correspondence—News Notes and Personals

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Published by -

LAND AND FREEDOM, 150 Nassau Street, New York

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, EDITOR

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.

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.

MARCH—APRIL, 1939

VOL. XXXIX

No. 2 WHOLE No. 213

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

NEW ZEALAND: { Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.
T. E. McMillan, Matamata.

SPAIN: A. Matheu Alonso, Tarragona.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

HUNGARY: J. J. Pixler, Ester Utca 9. Budapest.

GERMANY: Jng. Pavlos Giannelia, Vienna, IV Rainergasse 18.

INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	35
RICARDO'S "LAW OF RENT" INVALID...W. R. B. Willcox	36
RAISING HELL ON EARTH.....Stephen Bell	38
THE COMING HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS.....	39
LONDON SITE VALUE RATING BILL.....	39
THE LAST DEPRESSION.....Leslie Picot	40
FEDERAL HOUSING.....Jos. Hiram Newman	41
H. G. S. S. S. ACTIVITIES.....	43
CAUSERIE.....Thomas N. Ashton	45
PUBLIC EDUCATION AS A COURSE OF SOCIAL ACTIONWill Lissner	50
ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION REPORT.....V. G. Peterson	55
HENRY GEORGE ON TRADE RESTRICTIONS.....	56
PROFESSORIAL SIMPLICITY.....	56
BOOK REVIEWS.....	57
"GROUND UNDER OUR FEET; AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF RICHARD T. ELY".....Robert Clancy	57
PAMPHLETS RECEIVED.....	59
CORRESPONDENCE.....	59
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS	61

Please Make Subscriptions and Checks Payable to LAND AND FREEDOM

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXIX

MARCH—APRIL, 1939

No. 2

Comment and Reflection

DAVID LAWRENCE, editor of the *United States News*, also conducts a daily syndicated column designated "Today in Washington." It is widely read by a conservative reading public. His connection with a newspaper, having its seat of publication in the Nation's Capital, combined with such a title for his column, is apt to carry much weight with the average reader.

ONE of his recent articles bore the sub-title "Inequitable Taxation Declared One Cause of Unemployment." Only *one* cause of unemployment? What a vision would have been his could he have said, *the* one cause of unemployment. But this he does not see nor do the great masses of men. A one and only cause! Impossible, there must of necessity be many! Yet we take courage when one writer, so widely read, gives publicity to the idea that even a kind of taxation causes unemployment. Can it be that the terrible burden of taxation now engulfing civilization and acutely affecting the middle class, is stirring thought on the subject? Such a sub-title is bound to attract the attention of not only his regular readers but also those who are fundamentally concerned with the incidence of taxation. We find him saying "this subject has been confused with the question of soaking the rich" but now "is being discovered to be a direct cause of unemployment." Direct cause! An able writer is doing some thinking. He is getting closer. Possibly he visualizes indirect taxes and how they are shifted and pyramided.

HE then points to the payroll tax as the biggest single factor and cites figures concerning a survey made in a particular industry and the devastating effects of this tax upon business and industry. Again a glimpse of the truth! Can it be he reflects the inarticulate thought of his conservative readers? If so we must forgive his not thinking it through when he offers *his* program. Like those who profess to have a knowledge of the Science of Political Economy (but never admitting its scientific aspects) Mr. Lawrence suggests "a pay-as-you-go financing out of general taxation on a *capacity-to-pay* basis."

Let us not be too critical. Taxation on the basis of capacity (or ability) to pay is an old concept, one hard to

dislodge from the average mind. It is associated with the idea of contributions and that if one has wealth or property he ought to be willing to pay and should pay in proportion. No consideration is given to the idea that this payer is entitled to receive an equivalent for his payment or on the other hand that a tax on wealth may be passed on, shifted to those less able to pay. We, too, are opposed to "soaking the rich" and we are equally opposed to soaking anyone. We are opposed to the capacity-to-pay theory of taxation, because it can do nothing *but* soak the rich, and the poor and everyone else. We, as Georgists, are concerned with the capacity and willingness to learn the truth about this subject of taxation. It is a big subject, yet properly approached, a simple one. We applaud David Lawrence. He is approaching the truth.

STILL another, but yet more definite approach to the truth, has come to our notice. In making a bid for new advertising business, the *Omaha World-Herald* of Omaha, Nebraska, has very intelligently called attention to the seriousness of the tax situation throughout the country. They state in their advertisement that:

Nebraska has
No income tax
No sales tax
No bonded debt
More money for living and spending.

Naturally, we are aware that many more No's could be added, thereby providing so much "more money for living and spending," not only for the good people of Nebraska, but for everyone in the entire world. The *Omaha World-Herald* has indicated a trend of thought in the direction of sound economics. This trend needs only to be followed through.

IF capacity-to-pay is intended as a means of attaining moral and economic uplift, we wonder at the lack of its observance, except as applied to the proverbial charity of the poor, and the levying of taxes on the production of the workers.

In practice, the formula seems to take on the somewhat paradoxical corollary that the greater the paucity of means to pay, the greater becomes the capacity for pauperiza-

tion of the victim. For instance, when translated to the calling known as relief work, capacity-to-pay adds unto itself the plaintive "Give until it hurts." That it hurts a \$15 a week wage earner to contribute a day's pay to a Community Chest campaign is painfully true, *but* do we find any such practicing of what they preach by the beneficiaries of institutions primarily responsible for the necessity of alms-giving. To be sure, the latter sometimes make the front pages in the apparent generosity suggested by four and five figured contributions. They have done well, in a fashion. Yet it is hardly to be supposed that the small contribution of our workman is matched, in spirit, by the merely larger ones of his "betters." Only a smug "philanthropist" would pretend to believe that one-hundredth of a millionaire's income (and how few can, in the true sense, honestly make a million dollars a year) is worthy of notice alongside one-hundredth of a factory girl's wages contributed to the needs of the less fortunate.

Perhaps we have been placing too much emphasis on *voluntary* contributions from the low scale income groups. More might be said about the additional burdens they bear, under the institution of "capacity-to-pay" as applied to taxes. Anyone who has studied the incidence of "capacity-to-pay" taxation knows that it bears most heavily on the poor.

Capacity-to-pay! We wish that those who most benefit from the coining of this misleading catchphrase could themselves abide by it. If only they could lawfully return to the community's rent chest what they have been allowed by law to appropriate from it, there would then be no excuse for the makeshift Community Chests we have with us today.

Attention, *Saturday Evening Post*

"THE values along a highway are so obviously created by that highway that the rights in them belong to the people who created and use the highway, and *not to the private property abutting*, so the scenery of the state is an asset belonging to the people of the state and the country as a whole."—Editorial in *Saturday Evening Post*.

One of our subscribers wrote to the *Post*, as follows:

If land values belong to those who make them and not to the site owners, then, it seems to me, the people own a good deal more than "the scenery" and Henry George was right in demanding that all this value be collected by taxation for the use of the people who made it.

I am having a bill introduced in the Legislature to collect these public-made values in Philadelphia for the use of the people. May I have your help in passing it?

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD SUDELL.

NOTICE

ON account of the continued confinement of the Editor, Joseph Dana Miller, resulting from an accident as reported in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, we ask the indulgence of our readers for the delay in getting out this number.

We take this opportunity to thank our subscribers for their cooperation. We also wish to make grateful acknowledgment of the financial help which is being accorded LAND AND FREEDOM, regretting the inability at this time to personally acknowledge receipt of remittances.—ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

Ricardo's "Law of Rent" Invalid

By W. R. B. WILLCOX

IN his article, "Land Owners Pay No Taxes," in the January-February, 1939, LAND AND FREEDOM, Mr. Harrington predicates his argument on the generally accepted soundness of Ricardo's "Law of Rent." The present writer denies the validity of this "Law." If to do so be deemed the consequence of a subtlety of which he happens to be enamoured, may he be forgiven; but he ventures the assertion that this "Law" has served, chiefly, to thicken the economic fog through which civilization would appear to be stumbling to destruction.

Mr. Harrington states this law as follows: "Rent is the *excess* product or value of any land over that of the poorest land in common use." From this he draws the customary conclusions, namely: "This excess is 'rent,' or 'ground-rent'. It is a free gift of nature. It has cost nothing. It is sometimes called the 'unearned increment.'"

There is no question that the inscrutable processes of nature result in increments in certain combinations of nature's elements at no cost of human exertion, hence, are unearned so far as mankind is concerned.

For example: The transformation of a few kernels of grain into fields of wheat results in an unearned increment of wheat. So, too, the migration of fish, the growth of forests, the formation of coal, result in increments of comparable character. Some of these increments are completed in days, weeks or months; others, in hundreds or thousands of years. But whatever their nature, or whatever time has gone into their formation, these increments are independent of human exertion, hence, have cost mankind nothing.

Furthermore, if, when these transformations are completed, men do not take advantage of the increments which result from them, nature's processes will return them to the elements whence they came, and these "unearned increments," these "free gifts of nature," will have vanished.

The only gift nature makes to man, apparently, besides

life itself, is the freedom to *work*, that he may gain access to, and can get, these increments when the latter have reached a condition of usefulness to him. These increments, use of which in some form is essential to the life of every human being, are free to mankind only in the sense that they are free to be obtained. So truly are they the results of nature's processes, and of these processes alone, that no man is to be compensated for them in any state in which they are to be found in nature.

It is obvious that if these increments of nature are to be obtained, men must labor, either directly or indirectly, to get them. If directly, their compensation will be such part of these increments as they get—their wages. If indirectly, their compensation will be wages in return for the labor expended in the varied operations necessary to provide instruments and conditions to aid all human activities; or it will be interest in return for the use of these instruments and conditions. Wages and interest will be exchanged for the increments obtained directly by the labors of others.

When this labor is the labor of individuals, or groups of individuals such as partnerships or corporations having the legal status of individuals, compensations can be apportioned directly to the parties in interest. But when this labor comprises the inter-related activities of the entire population, incidental either to individuals earning their own livings or to governmental undertakings, compensations can not be apportioned directly to the parties in interest.

Therefore, these latter compensations must be made to all of the citizens through their agent the government. They will be proportioned, naturally, to the benefits which each citizen elects to obtain, by locating where such of these benefits as he needs or desires are accessible. These compensations constitute rent.

Rent is not the "excess product of land." It is not any "product of land." Wherever and however the increments mentioned appear and disappear, they are the results of nature's processes. But rent, which only appears and disappears in proportion to population, or properly speaking, in proportion to the *activities* of population, is the product of human exertion.

This is true not only where these increments are most prolific, that is, where the "land" is most productive; but it is true, also, where the "land" is "the poorest land in common use." The usefulness of these increments to mankind, hence, their value, awaits upon their procurement, and varies in proportion to the social and governmental contributions to their utility. Payment for the benefits of these contributions is rent.

That, under the existing economic system, any rent appropriated by an individual is an "unearned increment" to him, is not to be gainsaid. But so, too, would it be an "unearned increment" to *society*, if the latter did not compensate those whose individual labors are expended in making the social and governmental contributions

mentioned. Mankind cannot get anything in this world without labor.

However, under a scientific economic system, rent would not be an "unearned increment," a "free gift of nature," to any one, either to individuals or to mankind. Rent would consist of compensatory payments made by individuals to society, through the latter's agent the government, "for the advantages of social and governmental contributions to the utility of provisions of nature." Its disbursement by the government, in providing society with these social and governmental advantages, would consist of compensatory payments to individuals for their labor in providing these advantages.

Ricardo's "Law of Rent," therefore, is invalid, since it is based on a false assumption, namely: that, since the processes of nature are independent of human exertion, mankind *acquires the results* of these processes independent of human exertion. This, of course, is not true. Mankind's acquirement of these results "costs" human exertion; and rent, which is compensation for the human exertion required to provide social and governmental advantages, cannot be a "free gift of nature."

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The above article is, of course, the opinion of Mr. Willcox. Further comment will be made in a subsequent issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

WITHOUT ties to bind the people to the land, they have been driven, especially of late years, in ever increasing multitudes to the towns. Here, they have herded apart from the better classes, forming an atmosphere and a society marked on the one hand by an absence of all the elevating influence of wealth, education and refinement, and on the other by the depressing presence of almost a dead level poverty, ignorance and squalor. They are not owners either of the scrap of land on which they live nor of the tenements which contain them; but they are rack-rented by the agents of absentee landlords, who know less of them than Dives knew of Lazarus.

Address of Cardinal Vaughan
to Catholic Truth Society, New York.

Here's A Thought

THE Perry County *Times*, of New Bloomfield, Pa., says editorially:

To suggest that it is our duty to save the democracies of Europe when we have not saved the workers of our own republic is absurd. To suggest that we as a government should go to the rescue of peoples beyond the sea when we have not saved the property of our own nationals in Mexico is hypocritical.

THERE can be no real progress unless there is a moral development with every mechanical aid.

EMERSON.

Raising Hell on Earth

By STEPHEN BELL*

“AND He looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry.”

“Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may dwell alone in the midst of the earth.”

“Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because they have no knowledge; and their honorable men are famished, and their multitude dried up with thirst.”

“Therefore hell hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth beyond measure; and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth, shall descend into it.”—(ISA. v, 7-8, 13-14.)

“The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof?”—(JER. V, 31.)

If there ever was a period in human history when the prophets or teachers and leaders of the people were more busily engaged in prophesying falsely and inculcating erroneous beliefs in the minds of the people than now, I never heard of it. House has been joined to house and field to field until there is no place where men may live, work and earn an honest livelihood, our people are gone into the captivity of helplessness because they lack knowledge, hell hath enlarged herself beyond measure, and the glory, multitude and pomp of men are descending into it.

So far as learning the why and wherefore of all this, the Nazarene seems to have touched their blind spot when He said:

“They have Moses, and the prophets, and if they believe not them, they will not believe one though he return from the dead.”

Consider the beauty and exceeding richness of the earth, the dwelling place, storehouse and workshop in which we are placed! What a wondrous garden of beauty, prosperity and happiness it could be made by the friendly cooperation of men and nations! And consider the shambles we have made and are making of it! Why do we do it? Can there be any truer answer to the question than the one given by Isaiah, that we know no better?

There are those who, holding to the doctrine of “original sin,” insist that it is the innate cussedness in man that makes him behave as he does. Even so, what is that “original sin” other than the total ignorance in which all of us are born and from which so few of us emerge very far? It is my belief that little children were the favorites of the Nazarene because of their teachability rather than their innocence. Unfortunately that is a quality which too many of us, in our educational system, outgrow too early in life, with the result that we learn little of real value afterward. From this fact has arisen the saying, “You can’t change human nature.” That

is true, but it is equally true that human intelligence can be cultivated and developed.

Why are we not making the earth the garden it ought to be, the home of countless millions of prosperous and happy families thanking God for life and its blessings?

To cut a long story short, it is because we have discarded the Mosaic conception of the earth as “the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee” (all of us) for the pagan Roman conception that it is the private and personal property of a master class. They have discarded the wisdom of Solomon, who declared “the profit of the earth is for all” for the Roman idea that its rent belongs to its masters and owners.

The result of this misconception of land and its rent as private property rather than a communal trust is the misplacement of the burden of the public revenue. Society, instead of collecting its own, the rent value of land which only civilized society creates, levies on the private earnings of its individual members by taxing almost to death their economic activities, the products and processes of their industry and trade.

This misplacement of the burden of the public revenue has unbalanced the economy of the nation and the world and wrought immeasurable mischief. It has held out the promise of profit for the joining of house to house and laying of field to field for speculation until it is literally true that there is no place for men to live, work and earn a livelihood except by the permission of the masters who hire them. It robs labor and productive capital of their legitimate earnings until they cannot buy the products of their labor and the public buying power, the effective demand on which industry and trade depend, has largely evaporated. It is estimated and no one denies it, that, the costs and prices of the things comprising our standard of living are enhanced 25 per cent or more by the taxes, largely hidden, which are levied on them in the various stages of production and distribution. If these taxes were abolished, the things which now cost a dollar could be bought for 75 cents, leaving 25 cents for the purchase of more of the things we need and want. What this added demand for goods would do for unemployment can be better imagined than described. What the added demand of those now disemployed would do passes beyond the imagination.

Socialists and other “social planners” tell us the maldistribution of the national wealth and income requires the intervention and regulation of government. That is to say of the personnel, the politicians, who are the tangible representatives of our government. This is of the “wisdom of man which is foolishness unto God.” Would it not be more sensible to try first the natural freedom with which God has endowed us, and for which Lincoln aspired at Gettysburg—

“That this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom”—the freedom to earn an honest living, of which a larcenous system of taxation has deprived us?

*Author of Rebel, Priest and Prophet.

The Coming Henry George Congress

GREAT preparations are already under way, for it will be International in scope and great importance will be attached to it by reason of the fact that it is to be designated as a "Centenary Commemoration." The dates for the Congress will include September 2nd, which will be the 100th birthday of our beloved leader, Henry George.

Quite a number of European delegates are expected to be present. This portion of the preliminary arrangements is being very capably handled under the direction of Mr. A. W. Madsen, Secretary of the International Union For Land Value Taxation and Free Trade of London, England.

The International Conference is scheduled to be held in New York City from August 29 to September 4, 1939. The preparatory work is under the charge of Mr. Frank Chodorov, Director, and the Board of Trustees of the Henry George School of Social Science, 30 East 29th St., New York City.

This Conference will undoubtedly attract a great many out-of-the-country delegates, with a sizeable Canadian representation, as well as from all parts of the U. S. A., by reason of the great desire so many will have to visit the New York World's Fair, which will then be in progress.

For those who will be unable to come to New York, there will be local gatherings and conferences in furtherance of the Centenary Commemoration.

A suggestion which might materially assist those now engaged in arrangements would be for as many as can do so, to write letters to their local newspapers, apprising readers in general regarding this great gathering.

It has been suggested that state or local celebrations everywhere should be held on the actual date of the anniversary, Saturday, September 2, 1939. This would be effective as a combined demonstration throughout the world. Greetings from foreign countries will be sent, if the local groups in our country will advise the secretary of the International Union, Mr. A. W. Madsen, 34 Knight-rider St., St. Paul's, London E. C. 4, England, of the time and place such celebrations are scheduled to be held.

It is also suggested, should anyone have direct knowledge of incidents or episodes in the life and travels of Henry George, such as are not generally known, which would have publicity value, he should communicate them to the Henry George School of Social Science in New York City.

Another, and very excellent suggestion has reached us from a number of sources, regarding the possibility of interesting the Postmaster General of the United States (Hon. Jas. A. Farley), in the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp. All Georgeists, whether philatelists or not, should write to the Postmaster General and to individual congressmen, urging the adoption of this idea.

Georgeists *throughout the world* may confidently look forward to the next Annual Conference as the best and the most enlightening one yet held.

London Site Values Rating Bill

LAND AND LIBERTY of London, England, in its March, 1939, issue, has given us an account of the fate, in the House of Commons, of the London Site Values Rating Bill. Though its passage was throttled by the Conservatives (through the agency of an academic ruling by the Speaker of the House) our English friends have reason to be jubilant over the publicity connected with the attempted legislation. We have always believed that such programmes have real educational worth, and in this case the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values is deserving of much credit for its effective use of posters and literature during the campaign.

The bill lost not on its merits, but on a technicality peculiar to the English law in the matter of so called private, as distinguished from public legislation. Once before, in 1936, the London County Council had presented the measure to Parliament as a public bill, i.e., one to apply the principle of local option throughout the whole country on the issue of correcting abuses in taxation, but the government refused to listen to the representations of the Council. Then, in February of this year, the Council decided to have it introduced as a private bill, i.e., one to restrict the measure to the inhabitants of London alone. But the Tories, who trembled at the thought of land value taxation sweeping over England, had no intention of permitting its largest city to enjoy any such reform, despite the mandate the people of London had given their governing body to effect it.

To us, the most interesting aspect is the very small amount of rent the L. C. C. is asking the landed interests to surrender to the municipal treasury—2 shillings in the pound on the annual value of sites. This amounts to only 10 per cent of the annual rent. In the large cities of the United States the land owners are required to pay around 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of the annual rent, which is little enough.

It is worthy of note that the English bill avoided the cumbersome and tricky method of collecting rent (or rather 10 per cent of it, for a beginning) in the manner of the American system, which takes a percentage of the net rent capitalized into a selling value. Capitalized rent is an artificial value resulting from the vested-right-theory (a vested right being the right to get something for nothing) and the L. C. C. did well in not using it as a basis for raising revenue.

We marvel at the patience of our British Georgeists, and the determined manner in which they are attempting to scale the ramparts of the landed aristocracy. Their defeats, however, are but steps in the direction of victory. More and more of the local authorities are joining their ranks, and perhaps only a European war can wipe out their gains. Indeed nothing would be more welcome to the Tories than a Fascist government consequent upon a military course of action. We devoutly hope that such an event will not arise to undo the educational labors of our Georgeists across the sea.

The Last Depression

THE "depression" is now approaching its tenth anniversary. Fond have been the hopes, positive the predictions, that the "next" year would witness the "upturn." Men like Ford and other captains of industry, have even gone so far as to certify we are on the verge of the greatest era of progress yet known. Surely by now they must be known to be false prophets. Anyone honest with himself will admit that a feeling of resignation has replaced such wishful thinking.

The late Oscar Geiger, founder of the Henry George School of Social Science, as long ago as 1929 declared this to be the last depression, a very daring statement indeed. Those by whom the full import of these words was not appreciated felt that he was unnecessarily rash. Depressions had come and gone before. Why should this one be the "last?" But those who were nearest Oscar Geiger's thoughts knew he had spoken in the language of a true prophet, that this was not the utterance of a disappointed, disillusioned man tilting at the Pollyannas, but of one who spoke from the knowledge of a great central truth. For to him was it given to see the underlying basis of our social structure, and he unquestionably founded his statement on the principles of equity so beautifully and yet so fearfully expounded in the tenth book of "Progress and Poverty." He understood the full meaning of the concept of *freedom*.

"She will have no half service!" Thus did Henry George characterize the Goddess of Liberty. Looking back into history, we gather that something of this truth was also undoubtedly in Abraham Lincoln's mind when he declared that a nation cannot continue half slave and half free.

Indeed today there could hardly be found in the civilized world anyone to dispute the injustice of human slavery when recognized in the livery of the bondage Lincoln spoke of. For, pitted against such a gross form of evil, verily does justice stand out resplendent in full armor. Men *will* rally behind a good Cause when they become capable of understanding, even though it may take a while before they shake off the ignorance which alone can delay its realization. But suppose they are confronted with a wrong which is too subtle for their comprehension, and ignorance prevails over understanding. In that case can a nation or world of *such* men continue half slave and half free? Here we come to Oscar Geiger's prevision—his knowledge of the modus operandi of justice when called upon to eradicate that which mankind is too ignorant to cope with. Let us try to illustrate what we mean by taking a situation, one which is with us even now, where a people intelligent enough to outlaw a banal institution such as chattel slavery are not intelligent enough to recognize that same institution in a more insidious form.

It is of course wrong that society should fail to collect the ground value which its presence and intelligence

have created. Those are not moral laws which have permitted and still permit privileged individuals to appropriate the people's rent—to reap where they have not sown. Still in all, it is quite possible such a practice would not result in the economic crashes we have been experiencing *if* the beneficiaries of the privilege had been content with what we term the "economic rent." To be sure, most of us would be paying tribute to that degree, but had the injustice gone no farther it is probable we would have had a more stable economy, and be spared the wrath of those pent up forces which periodically descend upon us in the form of hard times.

But such an economy, even though as stable as that of the earlier Egyptian civilization must have seemed, is an affront the more terribly to be dealt with by outraged nature. Seeing such a subtle wrong, one that would likely go no farther were it content with half a loaf, she calls upon justice to summon an alchemy even more subtle, whereby the evil is made to pull down its house upon its head. In asserting her perfection she will not permit the owner of the earth to remain satisfied with "economic rent." Instead, she remorselessly conspires with all the elements to set in motion an irresistible impulse to cause the pernicious system to outdo itself—to demand an even higher "rent," calculated on the *future* gains of the private appropriation of the people's values.

Thus does justice employ evil to brew a poison we call "speculative" rent. Administered in ever increasing doses to labor and business (the source of all rent) the wheels of their industry slow down, and a depression comes forth.

Again and again does justice thus sound her warning to ignorance. She gives constant notice of a determination to put her house in order. For centuries her final stand, however, has been postponed because there was still some "free" land left, which provided a partial asylum for locked-out labor, enough to restore some economic equilibrium. But today the free land is no more. The prophesy of Henry George seems fulfilled—there is no escape. "The pillars of the state are trembling even now." The democracy we still enjoy quails before the forces of totalitarianism storming at the gates without, *and within*.

We do not mean to draw a picture of inevitable chaos and destruction. Georgeists must strive, as did Oscar Geiger, to make this really the last depression. If we can do it, *by abolishing poverty*, it is certainly worth all our efforts. On the other hand, if we do not spread the teachings in time, the world is probably due for the greatest setback of all the ages within our knowledge. But let us not complain if we go into darkest retrogression. We would *have* it so, rather than continue half slave and half free. For after all, *Justice* is the Supreme Law of the Universe, and if society be unworthy of life, then let it be gathered up—He maketh all things, He doeth all things well.

For the consolation of Georgeists—Well done, thou good and faithful servant.

Newark, N. J.

LESLIE PICOT.

Federal Housing

By JOS. HIRAM NEWMAN

UNITED STATES Senator Tydings of Maryland severely criticized the provisions of the Act under which the Slum Clearance program is administered. In a forceful and factual speech in the Senate chamber, which was reported in the Congressional Record of March 8, 1939, he laid stress on the extent to which government funds were being employed, not only as loans, but as outright gifts. Senator Tydings pointed out that the ultimate cost of government-fostered projects is highly conjectural, due to the fact that, in addition to the loan, which may under the law amount to as much as 90 per cent of the cost, the United States Housing Authority agrees to guarantee against losses in operating expenses.

The method of procedure calls for the formation of a Municipal Housing Agency, which enters into a contract with the United States Housing Authority. The contract provides not only for the required loan, but also for reimbursement to the Agency, in the event that the rent stipulated by the Authority is insufficient to meet the requirement of operation and management. However, the reimbursement cannot exceed 80 per cent of the deficiency. To this extent it takes the form of a definite rent subsidy and consequently, an outright gift. The Municipal Housing Agency provides 10 per cent of the cost of the project plus the site, together with 20 per cent of the deficiency. It can readily be seen how unreliable any estimate of ultimate cost will work out, when we realize that loan agreements may have up to sixty years to terminate. Consequently, the rent subsidies, if they persist during the loan period, with the likelihood of annual variation, become practically undeterminable.

Because of the keen interest taken by Georgeists in the general subject of housing and the costs thereof, we have taken excerpts from the speech of Senator Tydings:

So far 141 apartment houses in twenty-two States of the nation, the District of Columbia and Hawaii have been contracted for and are being constructed under the United States Housing Authority. The total cost of these 141 apartment houses, which will provide living quarters for 64,431 families, will be \$356,695,341, or an average cost per apartment house of \$2,529,045. This gives us an average cost of \$5,520 for each family unit in these new apartment houses supplanting the slums.

According to another agency of our government, whose activities are wholly confined to insuring private homes—that is, the Federal Housing Administration—the average cost of the average American home lived in by the average American family today is \$5,384. . . .

Moreover, by the contracts entered into between the United States Housing Authority and the cities of America, these new apartment houses supplanting the slums and, consequently, the families that will live in them, are to be exempted in whole or in part from local taxation.

This, of course, is quite understandable, since the local

Housing Agency is an integral part of the municipality which created it, and naturally cannot collect taxes from itself. This exemption therefore applies to *both* land and improvement. The Municipality, nevertheless, does assess the site and often exorbitantly high because there is no one to register a complaint that it is incorrect or unfair. The exempted assessment is carried on the Tax Rolls, often serving to increase the legal margin for "Borrowing Capacity." The practice, however, does not obtain in New York, being specifically prohibited by the State Constitution.

Senator Tydings had considerable to say regarding the Rent Subsidy portion of the Act. More excerpts of his speech follow:

But that is not all. The United States Housing Authority—and that means the government of the United States—has made contracts with each of the cities where this work is under way, providing that part of the rent of each family residing in the apartment houses which supplant the slums is to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. . . .

Why, you may ask, does the government propose to pay a part of the rent of each family occupying these apartments? Because of the high cost of the buildings—a cost not originally contemplated—it is impossible to obtain sufficient rental from the low-income groups to make the buildings self-liquidating, or even self-supporting. If a rental were charged sufficient to amortize the high cost of the apartment building, it would be very far beyond the means of this low-income group to pay. . . .

Note that the rents to be paid by the United States government over the sixty-year period on these 141 projects will amount to \$831,861,840, according to the figures of the United States Housing Authority report. This is approximately two and one-half times the original cost of erecting these apartment houses. . . .

If we divide the total rent subsidy by the number of families occupying these apartment houses, we find that the result is \$12,910 for each family. Moreover, this is actual money paid out of the Treasury of the United States. This means, on an average, a rent subsidy of \$215 per year for sixty years for every family living in the government apartments . . . to pay part of the rent of 64,000 families who are in a preferred class and who live in better quarters than does the average American and who at the same time are exempt, in whole or in part, from other taxation. . . .

The question of cost for these operations provoked some dispute. U. S. Senator Robert Wagner from New York disagreed with the Senator from Maryland as to what items do or do not constitute "cost." Here is another excerpt from Senator Tydings remarks of his understanding:

The cost of building a family unit in these new government constructed houses varies, of course, in each State. In New York State, one new apartment house is costing \$6,562 per family unit. In the city of Washington, right here in the Capital City, another of these government constructed apartment houses, wherein will be housed 246 families, will cost \$6,142 per family unit. These figures are far above the cost of the average house in which

the average American today lives, whether he built it, or owns it himself, or rents it.

Keep in mind the fact that these apartment houses, costing \$6,100 and \$6,500 per family unit, are, under the law, to be occupied by families with \$60, \$70 and \$80 a month income, or annual incomes of \$720, \$840 and \$960. Houses built by private capital, costing \$6,100 and \$6,500, must necessarily be rented for 10 per cent of the entire construction cost—that is, \$610 or \$650 a year, respectively, to cover amortization of the cost, taxes, interest, repairs, insurance, upkeep and so forth.

To this Senator Wagner replied and sought to show that Senator Tydings was in error in his arguments as well as in his figures. In this he succeeded, by showing that the figures cited by Senator Tydings included the cost of buying and wrecking the buildings to be replaced. Senator Wagner went on to cite figures from the Annual Report of the U. S. H. A. that the estimated cost per dwelling unit was \$5,098 which was a "preliminary estimate used as the basis of loan contracts" and that "on the projects where construction contracts had been let, the actual cost had averaged 11.6 per cent less than the preliminary estimates."

However interesting these figures, or the dispute regarding them may be, one fundamental fact clearly stands out to Georgeists. It is unsound, aside from being one of the many frauds and shams constantly perpetrated on a long-suffering body politic.

There was something favorable to be said for the New York State law, which provided for Slum Clearance through the erection of new buildings by "Limited Dividend Corporations." Such new multiple dwellings were exempted from taxation, unfortunately however, for only twenty years after completion. The site, nevertheless, is taxed and as is customary, the City official Assessor increases its valuation on the assumption that the improvement greatly enhances the value of the site. The Assessments of the general locality are also increased by reason of the enhanced availability of the surrounding area. By this procedure the Municipality benefitted by increased taxes, but so also did the adjacent holders of sites, through the "Unearned Increment." The New York State law referred to, expired by limitation several years ago, but was re-enacted to apply to cities of the first class, at their option. Municipalities, notably New York City, have since voiced their disapproval of its adoption because of the "loss" of revenue from the taxes on the improvement.

It may well be, that the New York State law had its evils, yet, without attempting to differentiate as to which of the two is the lesser, some fundamental objections to the U. S. H. A. might be pointed out. In the first place, the outright gifts in the form of annual rent subsidies will be from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 per cent of the cost of each project, thus, and to that extent favoring the few who may reside in better housing. Secondly, the tax exemp-

tion must be absorbed by others not so favored. If this absorption only had the effect of taking a higher percentage of the economic ground-rent, it would not be objectionable to Georgeists. But since it takes effect through the operation of a higher tax rate, it will bear most undesirably on improvements as well.

Believe It, or Not!

RUMMAGING among old clippings, one was espied which commanded especial attention. We could hardly believe our eyes when its source was noted. In fact, it could quite readily be used as our own, but that would be plagiarism. Therefore, we will quote it and duly accredit it:

"When Mr. Coolidge says that 'it took three generations of thrift, industry and intelligence to accumulate' the Wendel fortune he discloses the fact that he is unacquainted with its history. By violent exercise of imagination the family policy that resulted in the Wendel fortune might be conceived of as thrift of a sort, but that much-abused word in its worthy signification should not be applied to the process by which this typical product of unearned increment was assembled."

Pretty strong so far, isn't it? And flawless, too. But permit us to proceed by quoting further:

"Neither industry nor intelligence beyond the most commonplace marked the history of the Wendels. Their policy imposed a brake on progress.

"Their holdings of real estate stood in the way of city improvement. For three generations they reaped riches from the vision, the daring, the initiative of others and contributed nothing to the common fund. No act of civic disinterestedness, no deed of far-sighted constructiveness, no cooperation in community effort impairs the drabness of the record of the Wendel wealth; a town of Wendels would be a cemetery of civilization."

Aside from the foregoing being wholly acceptable to Georgeists, we can almost see the remains of what once was a perfectly good hair-brush but now quite useless, after having been so forcibly applied to administer a deserved spanking.

We had better, and before we forget in our enthusiasm, mention and give due credit for the quoted paragraphs to the editorial page of the New York *Sun* of March 27, 1931. And if you "see it in the *Sun*, it *must* be so!"

The author of the Editorial is not known to us (wish that he were) but nothing so outspoken on the "policy-page" of an important and conservative daily newspaper has ever before come to our attention. That is what makes it so noteworthy. At this point arises a compelling thought, that, perhaps the reason nothing like as good has since appeared from the pen of that particular writer, may be, that he has been consigned to obscurity;

perhaps to edit the sports, or the drama, or even the financial page. He most certainly should not have been dismissed; his power of analysis is by far too valuable; and a *good* newspaper can ill afford to dispense with the services of good writers and sound thinkers.

H. G. S. S. S.

Activities

THE second public forum was held at the School Headquarters at 30 E. 29th Street, New York City, on Sunday afternoon, March 5, 1939. Mr. H. Elenoff again presided and the room was filled to capacity, over 150 being present despite the inclement weather.

The principal speaker was Mr. Robert E. Bauer, who is connected with the legal department of the Institute of Distribution, Inc., of New York City. Mr. Bauer is a member of the New York bar, and co-author of "Retailers Manual of Taxes and Regulations." His address to the Forum dealt with the effects of taxes on business. He pointed out there were 104 separate indirect taxes now being levied on all the ingredients and component parts, including tools, machinery, equipment, lands, buildings, etc., etc., requisite in the manufacture and sale of a 15 cent cake of soap! He also pointed out that there are 127 cunningly concealed taxes in a pound of beef bought by a housewife at the butcher's counter. He was roundly applauded at the conclusion of his address and consented to reply to the rather numerous questions from those in attendance.

It is most gratifying to note how vastly improved is the teaching staff at the Headquarters School. Many of the instructors are attending the advanced courses mainly under the personal instruction of the Director, Mr. Frank Chodorov. The teachers are advised to do a great deal of added reading, aside from their textbooks, and to inject their own experiences into their work. Ten new teachers have been appointed this term, all of whom have had at least forty weeks of study before assignment.

The Spring classes are expected to have about 1,100 students. It is interesting to note that the intellectual standard of the students seems to be higher than heretofore, many indicating collegiate training. It is observed that there is now a larger percentage of men than women, and that they both seem to have a keen intellectual curiosity.

The Speakers' Bureau, under the direction of one of the graduates, Miss Dorothy Sara, has succeeded in obtaining numerous requests from clubs, societies, etc., for speakers to address them. Aside from the general educational value of the lectures, such audiences always have great potential possibilities for enrollment as students.

It also is very valuable experience for the newer adherents in the movement in their training as public speakers.

The correspondence course continues to attract enrollments, due very largely to the generosity of a "Friend," who arranges and pays for the insertion of advertisements in various publications. He has also furnished a list of names which have been productive of enrollments.

LONG ISLAND GROUP

A most encouraging review of the educational work being done in Queens and thereabouts was given on Friday evening, March 31, at the third "Graduation Dinner-talk Fest" at the Diplomat Restaurant in Jamaica, L. I. There was an attendance of two hundred at the dinner, and thirty-three graduates of the ten-weeks course of the Queens Extension of the Henry George School of Social Science received their diplomas from the hand of Mrs. Anna George deMille.

The Society of Long Island Georgeists was co-sponsor of the affair and the Acting Chairman of that Association, Mr. Benn V. Blum, was first speaker. He explained that the Society was not an organization, but was formed to further the Georgeist educational movement on Long Island, and—in his own words:

"to acquaint the public through class and lecture work with the message that the principles expounded by Henry George offer the only true basis of economic freedom and social justice, and that their application will abolish involuntary poverty, promote industrial and international peace, and make all other reforms easier of accomplishment."

Then Mr. Blum turned the meeting over to Dr. S. A. Schneidman of Bellaire, to whose energy and ability the promising spread of the movement in Queens is very largely due. Dr. Schneidman having attended the courses at the Henry George School in New York, is now teaching in Jamaica, and acting as secretary of the Queens extension classes.

There are three new classes in "Fundamental Economics and Social Philosophy" to be started in Queens, besides the regular Tuesday evening class at Public School 109, 92d Avenue and 213th St., Queens Village. The new classes will be held Tuesday evenings, beginning April 11, at the Jamaica Y. M. C. A.; Wednesday evenings, commencing April 19, at the Community Center of Andrew Jackson High School, St. Albans; and Thursday evenings, commencing April 20, at the Community Center of Public School 109, Queens Village.

Dr. Schneidman has also succeeded in interesting the Queens Forum Community Center as well as other organizations, in taking up the study of Henry George. The fact that it is possible to hold classes in rooms of public schools, is a matter of importance. We may soon, perhaps, be able to catch up with Denmark in having the philosophy of Fundamental Economics and Social Justice

as taught by Henry George, made a part of the curriculum of our High Schools!

Several of the graduates spoke at the dinner. Rather important were the remarks made by one of these graduates, Mr. Vincent McLean, who is Vice-President of the Central Queens Allied Civic Council, and President of the Central Civic Association of Hollis. Mr. McLean is also Chairman of the Committee on Taxes and Assessments of the Council, and said that he felt to it be his duty to his associates to investigate this Extension Course when it was brought to his notice. The result, he stated, was that he widened his own understanding of matters that had been obscure to him in the past, and that he would most earnestly recommend the course of study to all who would be effective civic workers.

Another graduate, John M. Michael of Lynbrook, Long Island, claimed that the knowledge gained in the class had helped him greatly in his insurance business. All the graduates who spoke praised Dr. Schneidman's work. And all spoke of the gain in their better understanding of social problems, both in its practical application to every day life, and in the hopefulness of a natural solution for the economic and social disorder with which we are now confronted.

Guest speakers of the evening were; Mrs. Anna George deMille, Stephen Bell, Lancaster M. Greene, Grace Isabel Colbron, Councilman Charles Belous of Queens, Walter Fairchild, Charles H. Ingersoll, Otto Dorn and Morris Van Veen.

It was a most successful and enjoyable evening, and a splendid tribute to the work done by our Queens adherents.

Perhaps the most successful monthly Forum, thus far, was held at the School Headquarters Building on Sunday afternoon, April 2. About 200 attended. Mr. H. Ellenoff presided as usual and introduced Mr. Louis Wallis, whose topic was "Democracy at the Crossroads." Mr. Wallis is widely known as an economist and biblical scholar; at one time he was an instructor of economics and sociology at Ohio State University. He is the author of numerous books, among the best known being, "An Examination of Society" (1901), "Sociological Study of the Bible" (1912), "A Study of Ancient Israel" (1931), "God and the Social Process" (1935), "Burning Question" (1937). His latest book entitled "State of War Permanent Unless—" was brought out in 1938. Most all of these works have been reviewed in LAND AND FREEDOM.

Mr. Wallis is an effective speaker on the lecture platform. Though he insists that he is not an orator, his wide knowledge of economics and history, plus his manner of delivery, produces a most convincing and pleasing address. Mr. Wallis opened his subject by first asking his audience for definitions of democracy and whether we have a democracy in this country. This method had the effect of "turning the tables" by heckling his

audience first. Among the many answers, all good, came, perhaps, the most all-inclusive one from Mrs. Amalia DuBois who said "We cannot have democracy without a free economy."

The principal stress in Mr. Wallis' talk was laid on the great burden which must be borne as a result of what he termed "the development of an aristocratic lop-sided taxation." He also pointed out that the importance of placing the burden of taxation on sources which would benefit wages the most, may be best illustrated by the ease with which a 10-pound weight can be carried on the shoulder as against the silly method of dragging it along by being tied to one's foot.

Mr. Wallis, very effectively traced the history of the formation of European Empires and the causes of wars, which, in all instances, have turned around the seizure of land. He further developed his speech by pointing out that Abraham Lincoln said that "we cannot go on half slave and half free." Neither can a democracy co-exist with the pressure of aristocratic taxation to the great discrimination of industry. Mr. Wallis spoke extemporaneously throughout and upon completion of his address the Forum was thrown open to questions, which came forward fast and some furiously; but they were all admirably handled by the speaker and to the great satisfaction of the audience.

The next Public Forum is scheduled to be held on Sunday afternoon, May 7, at the Headquarters of the Henry George School of Social Science, 30 E. 29th St., New York City. The Forum starts at 4 P. M., but the doors are open at 3.30. Admission is free. The suggestion to bring a friend not yet interested in our philosophy and to come early to get acquainted, is most appropriate.

NEW ENGLAND GROUP

Hon. George H. Duncan, a former member of the New Hampshire Legislature, was guest speaker at a Commencement Dinner of the Henry George School of Social Science, at the Twentieth Century Club rooms, Boston, Mass., on April 14. He has a class of legislators in Concord, N. H., teaching them the principles of Progress and Poverty. The foregoing item was given us by W. L. Crosman.

TO remove want and the fear of want, to give to all classes leisure, and comfort, and independence, the decencies and refinements of life, the opportunities of mental and moral development, would be like turning water into a desert.—PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

THE real and lasting victories are those of peace and not of war.—RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

AFREE COPY of LAND AND FREEDOM is an invitation to become a subscriber.

Causerie

By THOMAS N. ASHTON

BURN THE BOOKS

BY means of the Einstein theory of relativity we comprehend that Plato was a Single Taxer—if Emerson speaks with knowledge—because only Plato was entitled to Omar's compliment to the Koran, when Omar said "Burn the libraries; for their value is in this book."

To equate Einstein, Plato, Henry George, Emerson, Omar and all literature in one sentence taxes our crude capabilities for continuity and clarity of expression. It is the utter simplicity of the theory of relativity, alone, which brings our attempt to a form of relatively clear statement.

All things and thoughts are relative. Having a common origin, they cannot be otherwise.

No matter how greatly justified Omar may have been in his evaluation of the Koran, we are yet to be convinced that it makes more clear the virtue of truth than does "Progress and Poverty." It is one thing to point to a goal; it is equally important to point to the way when helplessness prevails. The Ten Commandments set for us limitations and objectives, mainly from a negative point of view, but leave us to discover the way handicapped as we are by the man-made theory of ability-to-pay taxes. The Ten Commandments might well be reduced to one—"Thou shalt not steal." Too few people know that they are stealing, morally, when they pocket site-values created by public improvements. Too many people have fed from the bottle of "legal" honesty and precedent whereby ground-rents honestly (?) may be pocketed by title-holders to patches of the earth's surface.

If libraries are to be burned, because of sufficient truth and procedure to be found in *one* book, then our old friend in the cultured Commonwealth of Massachusetts had justification for his ultimatum to his clergyman when he said "If I am to choose between the Bible and 'Progress and Poverty' I shall retain 'Progress and Poverty.'" Never has truth been made more clear—never has correct procedure been made more specific—never has been shown a simpler way for making the Ten Commandments immediately workable—than in the pages penned by Henry George. To teach our children the Commandments, whilst teaching them the legal honesty of pocketing site-rents, is to teach them thoughts which nullify each other. When truth and error simultaneously are taught as being identical, then chaos prevails—chaos resulting in the depression of 1929-1939—chaos resulting in WPA'S, AAA's and their allied tri-letter lunacies—chaos resulting in vice, crime and disease among the illiterate victims of smug educators and perimeter politicians enmeshed in the humbug of "legal wisdom."

The Koran is held to be a discipline "in logic, arithmetic, taste, symmetry, poetry, language, rhetoric, ontology, morals or practical wisdom," all of which may be laid waste and destroyed by an iniquitous system of taxation the like of which we now suffer. The same nouns may be applied to many great works, from the Ten Commandments to modern writings, and yet avail no attainments therefrom for the establishment of justice among humans as long as other recognized works teach procedures which nullify the virtues attributed to the Koran or what-all.

No other writing—be it Bible or Platonic or Socratic—has brought to us all the names of virtues ascribed to the Koran *together* with the knowledge of *how* to attain the fruits thereof, except that done by Henry George in the pages of "Progress and Poverty." Therein lies logic unsurpassed in demonstration—therein lies a complete exposé of arithmetic's accuracy—therein lies a "taste" which never makes mockery of culture—therein lies symmetry of observation, analysis and deduction—therein lies the poetry of spirituality—therein lies language which dispels ignorance, avoids confusion and comes to the issue—therein lies rhetoric which stands as a monument to fo'c'sle fraternities, to printing-press pedagogy, to library and book-shop universities; a monument which gives hard-press to professional propriety, elegance and force. Therein lies the ontology of taxation's metaphysicians who currently lay the cause of hard-times at the door of anyone but the taxers of industry and the exploiters of site-values. Therein lies morals or wisdom never more eloquently pleaded at the bar of conscience. Therein lies truth in all its pristine purity.

What more can priest or prophet or professor promulgate?

Plato and the Koran and the Bible have pointed to the star of truth. Henry George has built the highway to its shrine.

SINGLE TAX . . . OR ELSE . . . !

Single Taxers who have not read Mr. Garet Garrett's two articles in the March 18 and 25 (1939) issues of the *Saturday Evening Post*, should—by all means—do so. The articles present, in a well-written and interesting manner, an illuminating, detailed description of the day's struggle between employer and employee. Where Henry George sufficiently demonstrated, in a few words, the swords-points attitudes between industrialists and hired help as depicting the effect arising from the cause of private appropriation of public wealth plus the public appropriation of private wealth, Mr. Garrett employs the time and space to show in detail and in sequence the pyramiding of chaos between the so-called "capital and labor" factions of society.

While Mr. Garrett's articles forcibly bring home to the

readers thereof, a vivid picture of serious portent, no solution is offered other than to deplore being a law unto one's self 'midst a community of fellowmen similarly obsessed. This tenor of his closing remark at once raises in the mind of the student of political economy the query "How can one avoid being a law unto one's self when the common and statute laws sow the seed of consequences which leave no alternative in the face of self-preservation?"

In adhering to his purpose (to report labor conditions as they now exist) Mr. Garrett has done an excellent job. A job so excellent in raising one's hair and horror at what is plainly evident for the near future of society, that we suspect that our Single Tax skeptics may at last prefer to relinquish their direct and indirect partnership, in grabbing the unearned increment, as against soon facing the anti-social climax made clear by Mr. Garrett's report.

The two articles may be summed up in four words: Single Tax . . . or else . . . !

And this goes for everybody—whether they be kindly, tolerant, lukewarmists who are sympathetic to Henry George's proposal but who are irked by the Single Taxer's enthusiasm for his "one idea" and by his stubbornness in refusing to accept compromised truth—whether they be ardent Single Taxers who prefer free-lance latitude to unity's organized and singleness of ways and means—whether they be in the gamut of innocent victims from the Asiatic and Mexican "floaters" 'midst California's farms to the press-ganged recruits in New York's labor unionism—whether they be portly patrons of parlor programs in swanky Back Bay's community campaign to feed and foster Boston's north, west and south-end slum anemics.

And this goes for lip-service pols, self-taught labor-leader martyrs, professors of law, of economics and of religion. And this goes too, and doubly so, for educated captains of industry and of banking who easily comprehend corporation complexity, but who equally easily become perplexed by the simplicity of single-entry, single purpose, Single Tax.

Today the "white men" of the golden west fight among themselves for pittance pay at crop-time where the ripening honey-melon waits for neither mice nor men to argue or orate—fight among themselves for brief hire among the bleached blooms of tender peas whose fragile tendrils mock the might of crackpot agitators—fight among themselves for the very jobs which once they contemptuously dropped into the eager hands of Asiatic and Mexican helpers on the wondrous soil of our western valleys. By all means, read Mr. Garrett's articles and ponder well.

"It is Single Tax . . . or else . . . !

STUPENDOUS SCIENCE

"An engineer," says Doctor Karl T. Compton of the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, "is one who, through application of his knowledge of mathematics, the physical and biological sciences, and economics, and with aid, further, from results obtained through observation, experiences, scientific discovery, and invention, so utilizes the materials and directs the forces of nature that they are made to operate to the benefit of society. An engineer differs from the technologist in that he must concern himself with the organizational, economic, and managerial aspects as well as the technical aspects of his work."

Taken at its face value, this definition presents an overwhelmingness of the first magnitude. After catching our breath and comprehending the all-inclusiveness of the engineer's place in society, we wonder how we ever eluded the managerial directions of the engineers long enough to bring our nation into its present pretty kettle of economic fish.

We know that there have been several engineers abroad in the land, during the past third of a century, because we personally have served our apprenticeship with a few of them during the entire period. We, personally, are still "bound out," as it were, because as an economic slave serving under the duress of ability-to-pay taxes we never have evolved from an apprentice to a journeyman engineer. Double and triple taxation has so completely absorbed our weekly wage that the independence of a journeyman engineer ever has remained a condition of which to dream, until Henry George made clear to us how multiple taxation, upon the fruits, facts and fancies of labor, killed our engineering business and prolonged our apprenticeship drabness.

We, too, always believed that a real engineer was all that Doctor Compton alleges, but we needed a Doctor Compton to define us in writing. That is, we believed it in toto until Henry George showed us how little real and apprentice engineers know about economics. Until "Progress and Poverty" hove in sight we were blithely riding the wave-crest of apprentice-engineering—illusion, and we were publicly expressing our private opinion of the law profession which dominates the legislative factories at our State House and at Washington.

At times we look back with fond recollections upon our early days of blissful ignorance—ignorant of the insidious iniquities of our present tax system—days when we held respectful contempt for all not versed in mathematics, physical and biological sciences, power to observe and analyze and deduce, invention and the forces of nature, organization and management, all so ably juggled by the engineer who gave rise to Doctor Compton's definition. Where ignorance was bliss, was it wise to read "Progress and Poverty" and shatter our engineering idols and carry an economic headache the rest of our days?

Today we wish that Doctor Compton had not included

"economics" as one of the engineer's cellophane-wrapped virtues. Economics is a broad subject when viewed in its ramifications which touch everything from morals to mince pies. Economics involves much more than the economical designs of bridges, buildings, viaducts, subways, vehicular submarine tunnels, Grand Central Stations, and concrete mash-tubs for portly porkers. And yet—and yet—economics fundamentally is the most simple and most sure and most sincere of all sciences now that Henry George has made it possible to dispel the engineering and legal and political fog which hangs in a heavy haze around the heads of the so-called leaders of society.

Of what avail are all the scientific virtues of the engineer as long as the legislative lawyer writes laws onto our statute books which tax labor into idleness, tax capital into bankruptcy, and which pay the "unearned increment" into private pockets rather than into public tills? Of what avail are all other sciences, invention, discovery, organization, management, and the forces of nature, when truly scientific political economy is so violated as to periodically mow down the social order into depressions, recessions and, ultimately, into fallen empires grown to ruin and ragweed and rot? Of what avail are economically-designed factories which stand idle, or empty, from lack of business as idle men and women ceaselessly tramp by the doors vainly seeking employment? Of what avail are harnessed rivers and falls which pour endless electrical energy into neighborhoods where a kerosene lamp or a single bulb *must* suffice to brighten the evening hours of too many economic slaves? Of what avail are modern motors and dynamos packed with potential power for buzz-saws which wait to sing, when too many tenants of the slums *must* buck an alms wood-pile with nothing better than a seventy-cent buck-saw?

What causes widespread idleness, widespread bankruptcy, and widespread "hard times," despite the engineer's knowledge? Henry George has told the simple story, beyond cavil, in the pages of "Progress and Poverty." It is distressing to know that of all the discoveries made by engineers—since the day when curiosity first burnt its fingers—so very, very few of our scientific contemporaries have discovered the powerful paragraphs in "Progress and Poverty."

The engineer is, indeed, a man well versed in sciences—except in the science of political economy upon which his alphabet-blocks are built.

FIVE THOUSAND TIMES

"The search after the great man is the dream of youth and the most serious occupation of manhood," said Emerson in 1876, and, in 1939, the search had abated not one whit as taxes mounted and millions of idle men walked 'round in circles 'midst hundreds of thousands of idle, fertile acres which have grown to weeds or brush or grass.

Since 1876 not less than 5,000 federal, state and municipal elections have taken place throughout these United States—elections at which our voters 5,000 times have sought a great man to lead society along the paths of peace and prosperity and justice. Five thousand times have the people of this nation cast ballots in brain-beauty contests in search of miracle-men to manage our multiplied muddle of governments, since the day when Emerson observed that "We live in a market, where is only so much wheat, or wool, or land; and if I have so much more, every other must have so much less." Five thousand times have groups of the freest men in the world made untold wrong selections in seeking truly great men for public office.

"Let there be an entrance opened for me into realities," urged Emerson sixty-three years ago, "I have worn the fool's cap too long." If the spirit of 1876 justified Emerson's revolt against his cone-crowned chapeau, by what right do we of today dare don derbies disguising ourselves as men of intelligence? By what right do we, with three-score more years of erudition and éclat, make so bold as to perch plug hats atop our polished pates whilst paying public site-values into private pockets and whilst pilfering private wealth for public purpose?

"Life is a scale of degrees"—degrees once deemed enow in A.B.'s, M.A.'s, D.D.'s, M.D.'s, LL.B's, Ph.D.'s and the like—degrees now blossomed into NRA's AAA's, WPA's, PWA's, OARP's, and COD's, until the alphabet runs risk of petering out. If Emerson could but now take an East River tunnel under the Styx and pay us a visit as we muddle through Title 4, Chapter 6, Schedule C, Item 9, Paragraph 2-B of our tax-torture-forms, would he again say "The reputations of the nineteenth century will one day be quoted to prove its barbarism?"

How, now! Thinks't thou that the taxation barbarism of the nineteenth century has anything on that of the twentieth? Is the income tax of today less menacing than the "faculty tax" of colonial queerness?

Five thousand times, in three-score years, ten times five thousand politicians, steeped in professional brain-processing, pompously have squatted into government chairs only to lift like a leaf and be gone with the wind, whilst labor and capital baited each other and site-value exploiters bilked both. Our "missouriums and mastodons" of municipal mysteries pale into a population of pigmies as their pious perplexity engulfs their preference for triple-tax over Single Tax.

"For a time our teachers serve us personally as meters or milestones of progress," penned Emerson as Henry George simultaneously observed the class-worship. "Once they were angels of knowledge and their figures touched the sky. Then we drew near, saw their means, culture and limits; and they yielded their place to other geniuses." Ten times five thousand "geniuses" have yielded their positions of political power as their program for collect

ing taxes according to ability-to-pay—a programme for donating public site-values to private donees chosen by chance as Lady Luck lavishly loads monopoly's titles into the laps of a few fellowmen—brought to them not immortal fame, but a raucous Bronx boo as their means, culture and limits failed to materialize politico-economic miracles for the clamoring crowds.

'Tis said that every fact is related, on one side, to sensation—on the other, to morals, recognition of which has escaped the nation's electors in five thousand local elections since Henry George painted the pen-picture of tax iniquity flowing from the sensational tax scheme for robbing the rich to protect the poor—a scheme which works exactly to the contrary in effect. And yet, this nation's population has no difficulty in apprehending two sides of any other fact. Strangely, only on the subject of taxation have ten times five thousand office holders tossed morals overboard since the day when Emerson wrote:

"History is full, down to this day, of the imbecility of kings and governors. They are a class of persons much to be pitied, for they know not what they should do. The weavers strike for bread, and the king and his ministers, knowing not what to do, meet them with bayonets."

But bayonets have given way to ballots—ballots wielded by the mob, for and against ballyhooing politicians, as clumsily as crack-pot kings once balanced bayonets against slaves shouting for bread.

"You may talk as long as you please, gentlemen," said Napoleon Bonaparte as he pointed to the stars in the heavens, "but who made all that?"

"The heavens and the earth and all that is between them," reads the Koran, "think ye we have created them in jest?"

"We hope not," fearfully pray the lords of the land, "that site-values come of Divine jest, else our legal titles may not endure—titles which bring to us the right to levy tribute against the fruits of our share-croppers—titles which grant to us the right to hold idle our broad acres against the milling mobs of idle men which surge through the city's streets."

"We hope not," earnestly echo our legislative leaders' "else we might lack time, 'ere the morrow ends, to levy tribute upon our laborers—not for the public service we have given unto them—but because of their ability to pay and pay and pay whilst their brethren, turning to the unearned increment, reap and reap and reap."

PUBLIC OPINION

In bidding for the consideration and support of Mr. Average Man, for the Georgeist Science of Political Economy, the Single Tax movement appears as forlorn as a blind pedler of pencils holding a tin cup. At the same time, the Presidential program for Works Progress Administration has no difficulty in winning the heart-

felt thanks of the inmates of the House of Want to the tune of 54 to 63 per cent of American Public Opinion.

The man with an empty stomach is in no mood to ponder over the Science of Political Economy. The man with a full stomach seldom is in a mood to be his brother's keeper. A mind full fraught with the desperation of self-preservation cannot entertain any other idea during the ordeal, and its dogged adherence to the hand which feeds it is but a natural—an inescapable—result. A gnawing appetite is a condition and not a theory.

We have been interested to learn the conflict of opinions between the House of Plenty and the House of Poverty. Those in the "higher bracket incomes" dislike the President's spending program—dislike his "hostile" attitude toward business—dislike his "grab for power"—without offering a way out of the industrial chaos. Those in the low wage brackets believe that the President is "humanitarian . . . is trying his best . . . has helped the common man . . . fed us and gave us clothes when we lost our jobs."

To those who are disciples of Henry George the Wolf of Despair howls in the distance. The hour is dark.

Ye who are heavily laden and weary at heart—ye who trudge forlornly down the Highway of Life—ye who sadly meditate upon the moronic mouthings issuing from the political tower of Babel—take heed. Lift up thine eyes and open up thy heart unto a joyous tidings. Let the light of hope shine forth from thine countenance:

The creator of Mickey Mouse wins acclaim and renown. Dignitaries in the field of education have bestowed upon this gifted artist a much-coveted honor—The degree of Master of Arts.

Not without great effort and long years of labor has this distinguishment come to a wholesome and worthy toiler in the vineyard of fables. Not without dreary drudgery and infinite pains over endless details has this laurel crown come to rest upon a manly brow. It spells certain success for him who unswervingly sticks to his last—to him who patiently pushes his pen through pictorial allegories or through paragraphs of economic solutions to murky man's manifold muddles.

Ye who are burdened and weary, forlorn and sad, are beckoned anew to the goal of destiny. When educators come at last to recognize the worth of Mickey Mouse surely a similar recognition for Single Tax cannot be far behind. All in all these awards of Masters of Art are evidence enow that educators still are taking notice of mere man's humble efforts and, just as surely as Massachusetts pauses to grant political amnesty to Anne Hutchinson and her free thinking three hundred years after her banishment, it is certain that 'ere long the worthiness of the story of "Progress and Poverty" similarly will reap its just recognition and acclaim.

Public opinion marches on, masterfully molded by deft fingers in the laboratories of learning.

Though thy labors be of Sisyphean magnitude—though thy job be tough—though hic labor hoc opus—gird up thy Single Tax loins and carry on 'til some day public opinion smiles upon thy furrowed brow—upon thy gnarled knuckles and bent back-bone—upon thy thinned and whitened locks.

Some day public opinion will give approval to thy Single Tax propaganda, though thou hast been dead as long as Anne Hutchinson.

Be brave, dear heart; Mickey Mouse points thy way to the triumph of perseverance. The dawn cometh when the mantle of amnesty shall fall upon the free economic thinking of Henry George—when the degree of Master of Science at last shall tell the cockeyed world that the penwork of the creator of "Progress and Poverty" has reached the top of Erudition's ladder.

The classic fairy tale of "Snow White and The Seven Dwarfs"—dressed in brilliant hues, melodies, songs and action—does not begin to measure up to that older fairy tale known as "ability-to-pay and The Seven Taxes," yet we detract not one iota from Snow White's virtues and charm. We, too, have pushed a pictorial pen between the drops of sweat and the old work gives us a fraternal respect for Walt Disney, *but*, dress up "ability-to-pay" in gaudy colors, attended by haunting refrains and syncopated songs and snappy action and—oh boy!—it will lay 'em in the aisles and bring home masters' degrees from every modern university.

Be steadfast, dear heart; Mickey Mouse points to a brighter day in the Science of Political Economy. Mickey Mouse marches on arm in arm with Public Opinion.

Dust off another Cap and Gown. Prepare another parchment. Cut another bit of ribbon:

Single Tax is coming 'midst mice and men.

Commonweal Resumes Publication

AFTER three years, this ever welcome English journal of our movement has returned, under the able editorship of J. W. Graham Peace. Mr. Peace retains every ounce of that forceful spirit we so used to enjoy in his paper before it suspended publication.

Harshest truth and uncompromising militancy are the warp and woof of all the articles in the *Commonweal*. A few copies are on hand in this office which we will gladly mail to those requesting same. Under "Correspondence" in this issue of LAND AND FREEDOM will be found a letter from Mr. Peace, which speaks for itself.

PERHAPS we should not so much accuse political systems as pity mankind for demanding justice when men themselves are not just, or for asking for brotherhood without brotherly love among themselves.

ERNST TOLLER.

Some Thoughts on Intolerance

IT should not be necessary to remind those who profess belief in the Brotherhood of Man, that mere belief, without practice, is an idle gesture in the direction of tolerance.

The only sort of intolerance we willingly subscribe to is intolerance itself.

We hear people everywhere say, that something or other, or somebody, should be *stopped*. But that seems to be *all* that anyone is doing about it; they simply *talk* about it.

Now is the time when something should be *done* about it.

In this connection, we have a definite suggestion to make; whenever, or wherever, anyone is in conversation with others, who inject objectionable race-consciousness in derogation of *any* race, they should be *halted* at once.

Intolerance, *per se*, is wholly intolerable and *no* one should tolerate it.

May we not well profit from the lesson taught by Kahlil Gibran, who, in his "Sand and Foam" tells us: "I have learned silence from the talkative, toleration from the intolerant, and kindness from the unkind; yet strange, I am ungrateful to those teachers."

To do something about it does not impose a difficult task.

All that is required is to draw comparisons; justice as against injustice; freedom as against serfdom; liberty as against impositions; intelligence as against ignorance. Free and honorable discussions will do much to remove many prejudices.

No one should tolerate intolerance!

Old Law Tenements

IN a little brochure by James Felt on "The Problem of the Old Law Tenement" is found the information there are 63,000 old law tenements, all erected before 1901, comprising one-half the multiple dwellings in New York City. More than 5,000 of these structures have been closed, being not eligible for renovation, leaving 58,000 still in operation. Old law tenements and converted dwellings house about 2,000,000 of the City's population. The author points out the difficulties of the owners in deciding on demolition, minimum compliance with fire and other safety regulations, or rehabilitation. Presumably absent in Mr. Felt's mind is the idea of the efficacy of land value taxation for the correction of this evil.

THE criminal is not merely an individual delinquent, he is a social product. Society is chargeable with some portion of his guilt.—CALKINS.

Public Education as a Course of Social Action

By WILL LISSNER

(Continued from Jan.-Feb. Issue of LAND AND FREEDOM)

VI

Actually, the whole substance of any reply to the confused is set forth above. But I can understand that, with no first-hand acquaintance of the School method, those who fail to understand what the School's course of action involves may be as badly off as ever, for they have no experience to which to relate these ideas. I will speak more plainly, much as I hesitate to do so lest the temperate facts of the matter appear in a sensational guise.

What the supporters of the School are engaged in is, in the novelist's useful expression, "an open conspiracy." On every hand they see evidence of the accelerating growth of the principle of meeting force with "decisive" force, of opposing authority with "decisive" authority. And on every hand they see evidence that the democratic way of life is meeting its greatest challenge. Reaction is on the march, in America as well as in Europe and Asia. George was no prophet when he warned of "the new barbarians"—he was a precise social analyst.

Whether a native communism or, as is more likely, a native fascism be the outcome of America's situation today matters little. What does matter is that for those who would preserve human values the time for action is short; they must expend their energies with the greatest efficiency. This means that one can no longer concentrate upon attempts to achieve the ghosts of legislative devices here and there in the hope that they will teach a lesson before the reactionaries get around to nullifying them; reaction today is alert and hyper-sensitive about the maintenance and extension of its privileges. It means one must challenge the whole structure of reaction by mobilizing all the progressive forces of society against it. This is precisely what the active supporters of the School are doing.

I say this is aptly called an "open conspiracy." The policy is best understood when it is contrasted with the Communists' and the Fascists' "boring from within" policy. The obvious contrast, that our policy is designed to promote an American doctrine, ethical democracy and its corollaries of equality of opportunity, the preservation of human individuality in the midst of societal integration, the safeguarding of individual rights in the face of social necessities, whereas theirs is designed to promote a foreign one, is most superficial and hardly apropos. For our doctrine claims to be, and we believe it is, one as capable of universal application as theirs claims to be. The province of humanity knows no frontiers.

But unlike the Communists and the Fascists, the followers of the School's course of action have from the outset publicly explained precisely what they were doing and what they intended doing in the simplest, clearest terms. At the Memphis Congress in 1932, with a representative of the nation's press present, Oscar Geiger, speaking through the lips of Joseph Dana Miller, said:

" . . . If we are to do our part in leading mankind out of its economic and spiritual darkness . . . it is for us to supply the vision, the leadership and, above all, the *teaching* that is lacking in our present day. . . .

"The farmer more than any man looks to some tomorrow for his rewards, yet his work is done when, *today*, he has prepared his ground and sown the seed destined to bear the desired fruit. Its growth is in *other hands*. For him it is but to do his work well *today*, assured that in the measure that he has done it well, its results will be good.

"And so must *we* prepare the ground and sow the seed. The seed we know is good; in the measure then that the ground we select is fertile, and in the measure that we do our planting well, we, too, can be assured that the results may be left in *other hands*. 'The stars in their courses still fight against Sisera.' If we will but understand *Nature* we will believe in her and trust her; and if we do her bidding she will work with and for us. . . .

"It is the aim and purpose of the Henry George School of Social Science to teach fundamental economics and social philosophy to those still learning; to those to whom study is still a habit. It is its purpose to send these forth into the world of life and living; into their chosen fields of labor, industry, politics and education, so fortified that error cannot prevail against them: so prepared that truth, *our truth*, will, *through them*, reflect itself in every field of their endeavor."

One could not want plainer language. No more authoritative statement could be desired—these are the words of the founder of the School, spoken for him by a collaborator in its board of trustees who was then, as he is now, editor of the movement's organ. The point has been iterated and reiterated countless times since and perhaps most recently by Dr. George Raymond Geiger, pupil and disciple of the founder as well as his son, author of two of the School's textbooks and one of its manuals, editorial councilor of its official organ and its benefactor in countless other ways.

Dr. Geiger set this forth as plainly as Oscar Geiger had done in an article in "The Social Frontier: a Journal of Educational Criticism and Reconstruction," organ of the John Dewey Society and spokesman for some 5,000 school administrators throughout the country, in 1938.

Here Dr. Geiger pointed out that there are two distinctly different approaches taken by the follower of Henry George on the land question. According to the first, a solution of the land question affords a compromise be-

tween "individualism" and "socialism," and a refuge for democratic capitalism from "fascism" or "communism." He goes on (*italics are in the original*):

"Since this 'compromise' between 'individualism' and 'socialism' seems so crucial, the efforts of one group of Georgeists are centered on forming an enlightened public opinion which can recognize and effect such a compromise position.

"The more pessimistic of this group, convinced that some type of right wing or left wing 'revolution' is inevitable, are attempting to develop, say, a hundred thousand or more intelligent and persuaded followers of Henry George, who can be relied upon as a nucleus to salvage the economic system after it has been overturned by political catastrophe.

"Already they feel that they might be able to point to Mexico, and even to Spain and Russia (not to mention land reform movements in democratic countries like Denmark) as examples of this historical process, i.e., the gradual abandonment of various forms of collectivism, with concentration upon the socialization of land."

Dr. Geiger continues by pointing out that the second approach of the land reformer "is more limited and concentrated. Here, he confines his efforts to tax reform. . . . So, this follower of Henry George works to increase the taxation of land values and to exempt taxes on improvements, buildings, industry, and the results of labor." Then he goes on:

"With both these national objectives, however, the specific methods of appeal (propaganda, if you will) have been chiefly in the educational field. Active independent participation in politics on the part of 'Single Taxers' has been diminishing ever since the New York City mayoralty campaign of Henry George.

"For a number of years there was a national party which backed local and national candidates and before the World War there were hectic state campaigns, particularly on the Pacific coast, supported by the Fels Fund.

"Also, at present, there are periodic political efforts, especially through initiative and referendum measures, to introduce some measure of Single Tax into state constitutions; recent activities have centered in California.

"But *this political emphasis is now definitely secondary to the educational one.* The educational center of the movement is the Henry George School of Social Science, with national headquarters in New York City. Although founded only five years ago, the School has achieved a spectacular success. . . . Georgeists look upon the School as the brightest promise for any future success in the movement."

VII

By the test of experience this course of action justifies itself. In the clubs, societies and associations which organize the cultural life of the community, in the trades, the businesses, the industries and their associations which

organize its economic life, in the churches and the schools which organize its moral life, in the parties and the committees and the associations which organize its civic life, in all the instruments of popular enlightenment, alumni of the School, acting as responsible individuals, are struggling as leaders of their communities to achieve a democratic order. It would gladden Oscar Geiger's heart to see how surely the things he had visioned had come to pass.

In New York, the city with which I am most familiar, alumni are active as Georgeists in the Harvard, City, Rambam, Ho-Hum—and a score of other clubs. They are active in the Young Men's Board of Trade, the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, the Legal Aid Society, the Y. M. C. A., the Big Brothers, the Little Businessmen's Council, in Rotaries, Chambers of Commerce, Community Councils, trade unions as variegated as the musicians' to the journalists—the list is long enough to be boring.

To be complete the list would have to include men's and women's clubs of churches, schools and colleges, fraternal, charitable and philanthropic groups; in almost every field of community life their wholesome influence is being felt. Nor are the alumni neglecting their civic responsibilities as citizens, charged with certain political tasks as citizens. In their political parties—New York alumni are active in all three of the New York parties, the Democratic, Republican and American Labor, and were in the center of the smoke-filled room struggle over the platform of one at the last election—they are applying the principles they have learned.

Because of experience and training, they gravitate not only to the platform subcommittees of their parties but to the role of advisers and councillors, and are active as constructive critics of the country's and their parties' economic policies and as advocates of improvement of these policies on sound lines.

But this is also done by the Communist and Fascist "borers from within." What distinguishes the activity of the Georgeist is that he is acting as a free individual, under the discipline of nothing but his ripened conscience. Naturally, he cooperates with fellow-Georgeists when he finds them to be following identical interests with him. But he does so of his own free will, because he recognizes that they are best equipped to cooperate and collaborate with him and most likely to give him unselfish support. The Georgeist, when he chooses a group for his activity, promotes by his work the best interest of his group, for it is to that group that his own interest has attracted him, and it is the whole group that he wishes to infuse with democratic principles. The Communist or the Fascist is concerned primarily with promoting the fortunes of the party that has him under discipline; high ideals frequently give way to party log-rolling, to patronage considerations, to efforts to obtain domination of the group by means of minority factionalism.

Since they act as individuals who owe no allegiance to an outside organization which has its own machine to maintain, the Georgeists can devote themselves to constructive activities which win them the respect and the attention of their circles. The Communists and the Fascists, whose activities are highly organized, coordinated to the nth degree of efficiency by organization, eventually degenerate from high ideals to destructive partisan activity which wins them the condemnation of the very same circles.

The contributions of these alumni to the parties and the political movements to which they ally themselves as individuals are recognized and valued highly by the leaders and rank and file of those groups. If only the selfless patriotism of these alumni, fulfilling their responsibilities as citizens with such intelligence and clarity of purpose, were general throughout the Nation, we would not need to worry about the future of democracy in America.

In all discussion of organization one finds one or two persons who say that a name should be taken, any old name, and an organization gotten up, any old form will pass, and an office should be opened. What this has always meant has been that in the office is placed an executive secretary and a small executive committee, and the total of group activity is performed by the secretary and this small group (but chiefly by the secretary) simply because they cannot, for one reason or another, get anyone else to engage in it.

This is what is known in the American language as a "letterhead organization"; the phone books are full of them. But anyone who comes into contact with these organizations daily, as I must, sees clearly that the practical accomplishments of these organizations are small; in most cases trivial. I say this in no criticism of our Georgeist "letterhead organization." In most cases their officers are men I regard highly and their secretaries devoted workers. But the facts of any situation must be faced.

This type of organization, however useful it might be in proving certain services of specific nature, could never replace the activity and influence of these alumni and it could never be employed as an integral unit of their course of action. For that course implies not a small group in activity, but an ever-growing fraction of the leaders of the whole community. The effectiveness of this course of action is a function of the numbers of community leaders who engage in it and the scope of their interests.

I do not mean to imply that these alumni will not find it useful to get together as a group to take counsel together and to benefit from the sharing of their experience. Far from it. But that is the function of the Henry George Congress and of the World Conferences of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, as organizations, and of Land and Freedom and Land and Liberty

as institutions. Those who believe that "it is later than you think" see no purpose in duplicating the work of existing and functioning enterprises.

Nor do I mean to imply that these alumni forswear cooperation with and even active support of the effort of those whom Dr. Geiger labeled "tax reformers." I can cite several cases in point. In the recent Ralston campaign in California, when our California colleague met with unequalled vituperation and misrepresentation from their home press, I and other alumni in New York acting as individuals, discovered that the campaign of misrepresentation was spreading to the east. We were not engaged in the thick of the fight in pointing out certain shortcomings of the Ralston campaigners, obvious though they were to us. We jumped into the fight—as individuals—and launched a counter-campaign which stopped the misrepresentation in the east as quickly as it had begun. That was not the least of the expression of our solidarity with our California colleagues—as individuals.

Or another case. In New York, after years of research Walter Fairchild, a noted attorney and authority on urban land problems, launched the Graded Tax Committee to obtain the enactment of a graded tax bill, the most progressive piece of legislation framed on the soundest economic principles. I have never been solicited to contribute a penny to the work of the committee or an hour's time; neither has anyone else I know of. As a matter of fact, what I know about the committee's work comes from newspapers I read and civic workers with whom I come in contact. But the bill has obtained the sponsorship of legislators representing the three New York parties and it is thus a non-partisan measure. I have been interested to read of the activities of alumni in behalf of the measure. I read that they have been delivering speeches about it before various political and social organizations and have obtained various endorsements of it. This activity, I would like to emphasize, is one in which the School as a collective entity has taken no part—one which was, as far as I know, unsolicited and was given voluntarily by each individual concerned.

The School, it is true, has certain routine tasks incidental to the conduct of an educational enterprise for which numbers of alumni and supporters are required as volunteers. These tasks include the secretarial work in the classroom, writing of letters to editors and others who control instruments of public opinion, arranging addresses to introduce the School to various groups; addressing mailings, carrying on research work, etc. It is quite true this voluntary activity needs to be organized.

But it is equally true that this voluntary activity is and always has been organized. At first it was organized as a council. This form proved incapable of expansion to encompass new tasks and a new one was adopted, complete formal organization. This form was found to be

ill-adapted to the situation; there was a pronounced tendency for the nominal members to leave the work which was the organization's sole purpose to the officers, and for the officers to shirk it because the members would not undertake it. So a new form was adopted by which specific tasks are given compact, cohesive groups, each group being responsible for the discharge of a set task, and now the work is being done.

I can speak intimately of this also, for I have been in at the founding of these groups under each of these forms from the beginning. We are no worshippers of form; it is the substance we seek. The faculty has been organized as a faculty from the beginning and meets regularly in New York—and no doubt this is also true of faculties elsewhere—to discuss its work. The age-old faculty form of organization, which has its roots in the medieval universities, has been found to be ideally suited for this group, so its members have no disposition to change it. When these forms no longer serve the purposes of the groups concerned, they may be depended upon to modify or scrap them.

Thus, if those who suggest organization of the alumni are concerned about the discharge of these tasks—writing, addressing, researching, teaching—one can only reply that the work is being done efficiently and it is highly organized and thoroughly coordinated.

If, however, what they really wish is to see the alumni organized into a national or local association to achieve certain tax reforms in one place or another, the supporters of the School have no objection. What the supporters will not do, however, is to bring pressure on the individual alumnus or alumna to join one organization as against another, to make financial contributions to one as against another, or to join any particular organization of this type.

Nor will they make it possible for others to bring this pressure by permitting the records of the School to be thrown open. The importance of the assurance given at the opening of the classes, that the School has nothing to sell, is attested at every registration by the understandable suspicion of the registrants that there must be the taint of commercialization lurking somewhere, that there must be a "catch" in the offer of free courses. This assurance is meant literally by each instructor who gives it. To turn it into hypocritical statement is to sacrifice some registrants, and they cannot be spared, and to change the attitudes of the others, which militate against the success of the educational process.

But this should be no bar to those organizations whose officers, constitutions, purposes and achievements are intrinsically attractive to those who are infused with Georgeist principles. The alumni are, as part of their training, introduced to the periodical literature of the Georgeist movement. These periodicals for the most part sell advertising space freely. Through advertise-

ments in these periodicals such associations can reach the alumni with whatever message they have to give them. (Advertising, incidentally, is cheaper than direct mail when reader coverage is highly concentrated.) Only their own limitations will hamstring these organizations if they should be hamstrung. If the type of activity offered is such as to appeal to the individual alumnus or alumna, he or she will respond. But he or she will do it of his or her own free will. And if, in these respects, the organizations are such as to attract alumni, the supporters of the School will not only have no objection but will be exceedingly glad.

If those who suggest organization for the alumni wish to see a group effected to bring the alumni together regularly for renewed inspiration in their work, the supporters of the School point to the prior existence of the Henry George Congress for this very purpose. It may be that the Congress ought to be held regionally as well as nationally, since most alumni cannot afford the time or the expense involved in travel. That is a matter for considerable discussion; regional congresses may detract from the service now rendered by the national ones.

Possibly such Congresses ought to be held oftener than once a year, but I doubt it—a little oratorical inspiration goes a long way; the movement's literature is also an agency which provides inspiration; and the alumni are busy both in their business or professional careers and in their activity as supporters of the School or—and often it is—as community leaders.

However, there is one point to which I should like to give the strongest emphasis. If those who suggest organization of the alumni have any thought that such an organization would be, or might develop to be, an organization to discipline or to influence—the difference is one of degree only—these alumni in their work of building an ethical, democratic social order as community leaders, the answer of the supporters of the School is an emphatic, unyielding no.

They will tolerate no subversive factionalism. They will countenance no efforts to hamstring these devoted citizens in the discharge of their responsibilities to humanity and their country.

The work of the alumni is going on with the highest efficiency, thanks to the course of action they follow. It shall go on, for the salvation of democracy, for the salvation of western civilization if need be, until its goals are achieved.

* * *

All this is what Oscar Geiger knew; these concrete actions were those he expected from his work. He knew that a variety of interests integrated his students into the life of the nation. He knew that they would infuse the principles of an ethical, democratic social order into the life of the nation through those interests, the avenues they were best shod to tread their way upon. His notion,

like his ideas about educational technique, has stood the best test, the test of experience, the test of practise under widely varying conditions.

From the first, those who have been identified with the school have looked upon its reason for being as that of democracy's best and possibly last bulwark. The bulwark has held so far against the tide of barbarism; the task of every lover of liberty and every friend of humanity is to throw his shoulder against it so that the bulwark will hold.

Norman C. B. Fowles

THE passing of Norman Fowles leaves us with many thoughts concerning him. Always a great teacher, well able—and willing—to explain the great truth which he saw and to which he devoted a large part of his life, there are many left behind to whom he passed on the torch of understanding, and who will be ever grateful to him for knowing something of the answer to our economic ills.

As one of his students at the Henry George School of Social Science, the writer learned much—not only of economics—but also a great deal about how man is affected by the economics of the environment he lives in. No student of Mr. Fowles could leave his class with the slightest trace of bitterness toward anyone. By way of illustration, in the case of a man who closed down his mill in a town where everybody depended upon that mill for a livelihood, or a man who held large tracts of valuable, needed land out of use, and who refused to sell it or improve it except for a prohibitive price, so that great numbers of people in the slum areas suffered from poor housing, according to Norman Fowles, no blame could attach to such a man. He was merely the product of his environment and knew no better. He did not understand what he was doing because he had never learned the truth. If men had clear understanding of these problems, said Mr. Fowles, they would be solved. Therefore, he urged us to educate, and keep educating, and never to become discouraged. He always felt that some day a leader would arise from those who had been enlightened. He also warned against a reform put through suddenly, before the people understood it enough to want it, as such a reform would not be lasting, and the people would throw it off. Mr. Fowles believed that the immediate answer to solving our economic ills was to teach to the masses the great truth to which Henry George gave voice.

When Oscar Geiger, founder of the Henry George School of Social Science, passed on in 1934, Mr. Fowles took over the directorship. In the spring before Mr. Geiger died, he had said to Mr. Fowles and to Will Lissner, "I want you two to carry on if anything happens to me." At that time neither Mr. Lissner nor Mr. Fowles thought that the founder was ill; but when he passed on, they remembered and respected this request.

Among Mr. Fowles' writings for the Henry George movement are the words for several rally songs; a scenario for a photoplay entitled, "The Common"; also a series of "Dialogues" in the style of the Socratic method, expounding the economics of the Movement. Nor shall we ever forget the oration on "Liberty" he delivered a few years ago in New York City.

I have said nothing about Mr. Fowles' bright humor in the classroom and in his conversation. As I write, I remember how many a time we sat in class, chuckling at one of his jokes on the incongruity of something or other—likely as not on something in our economic system. I also remember being wet-eyed on occasion from contemplating the ideas he transmitted concerning the ills of mankind.

It seems appropriate, in summing up the life and character of the dear one who has passed from our sight, to quote the following lines from the Bible as best expressing the essence of the man who was Norman Fowles: PHILIPPIANS 4:8. "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

ROMA B. HALPERN.

Another Glimpse

DR. HAROLD G. MOULTON, president of the Brookings Institute of Washington, in an address declared that "at the present time grave fears are entertained with respect to the future of the economic system in this country," and presented what he considered the fundamental requirements for sustained progress.

"In recent years," said Dr. Moulton, "the view has been widespread that we have had so much scientific and technological advancement that we are menaced with overproduction and that in consequence we must expect the rate of industrial progress to be severely curtailed.

"There must be constantly increasing efficiency in production on the part of both labor and capital. Only by everlastingly improving technical processes and lowering the costs of production can we obtain progressively higher standards of living. To try to accomplish this result in any other way means simply tugging in vain at our collective boot straps.

"As efficiency is increased, the benefits must be broadly disseminated among the masses by means of high wages, low prices, or a combination thereof."

Editor's note—So far, so good. But what about *land*, doctor?

PROTECTIONISTS do for us in time of *peace* what enemies *try* to do in time of war—block our ports.

HENRY GEORGE.

Robert Schalkenbach Foundation Report

IF your eye has already strayed to the bottom of this report, you have noticed that it is not signed by one whose name has become familiar and dear to the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM. Early in March, Mrs. Antoinette Wambough, Executive Secretary of this Foundation, left the hustle and bustle of the business world for a quieter life at home. You who have read her reports and enjoyed correspondence with her know the deep devotion to the Foundation and its work which colored her many years of service. We shall all miss her very much.

The Foundation has, for over a decade, maintained headquarters at 11 Park Place, occupying a pleasant suite of offices overlooking City Hall Park. In the last two years, however, as the work grew and grew, our space became sadly inadequate. This spring it was decided to look around for a larger home. As most of you know, the Henry George School of Social Science now occupies its own building on East 29th Street and some of the space is not being used to the fullest extent. What more natural, then, than that our Directors should accept the invitation of the School to share the building with them? We shall occupy attractive quarters on the ground floor with our own entrance and a small window facing the street. Here we shall display our books. The work of the Foundation will go along in the same manner as it has for the past fourteen years, separate from any other organization and related only in respect of aims. With our larger quarters, and our increased facilities, we hope, indeed, to be more useful and more fruitful than ever before.

Interesting work is being done in C. C. C. camps in different parts of the country. We have already reported an active group in a Michigan camp; now we learn of the forming of a study group down in Texas. Today we heard from our Texas worker. He reports progress in the forming of study groups in his camp but bemoans the fact that "his boys" find it hard to understand "Progress and Poverty." We have sent him a dozen copies of the simpler version, "Significant Paragraphs From Progress and Poverty," by Harry Gunnison Brown. Where, more appropriately, could the seeds of freedom be sown than in C. C. C. camps, the very members of which are victims of our present economic errors?

We have had some correspondence with the trustees of the American Foundation for Abundance. This organization has a weekly newspaper of considerable circulation and has promised to help us to publicize the hundredth birthday of Henry George this September. A letter we received from these people is interesting. Speaking of the editor of their newspaper, it said: "The editor was for years a co-worker of the late Tom Johnson

of Cleveland and was himself actively engaged in the Single Tax Movement. While he has never given up the idea that our land should be returned to the people and possession of it based on occupancy and use, he would accomplish this in a somewhat different way than through the collection of economic rent. That, however, makes no difference in his and our respect for the splendid pioneer work done by Henry George and his collaborators in the Single-Tax Movement."

A new translation of "Progress and Poverty" into the Dutch tongue is now on sale in Holland and will soon be available in this country. Almost two years ago Mrs. Anna George deMille and the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation undertook to furnish a good part of the money needed to bring out this Dutch edition. Our many friends who helped with the fund will be glad to know that the book is now actually in use. Mr. H. Kolthek in Groningen, Holland, made the translation.

At the Associated Industries of Alabama convention to be held this month in Birmingham, Alabama, literature supplied by this Foundation will be distributed by Mr. E. W. Walthall. Though not a resident of Birmingham Mr. Walthall will travel to that city for the special purpose of putting our literature in the hands of the state's business men.

During the early part of March the Foundation performed an interesting experiment. We took one thousand names of readers of the magazine "Business Week" and circularized them with pamphlets written by Henry George and Professor John Dewey. The response was sufficient to convince us that those who follow the nation's business are willing to give hearing to a plan that will liberate the world from the state of dependency, the ever-present threat of war, and the downright poverty which exists today.

May we reiterate: after May 1, 1939 our address will be 32 East 29th Street, New York City. Send in your orders and requests as you always have done. There will be no change in our policies, but, we hope, an increased opportunity to serve.—V. G. PETERSON.

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

SOCIAL PROBLEMS, BY HENRY GEORGE.

IT is not the business of government to make men virtuous or religious, or to preserve the fool from the consequences of his own folly. Government should be repressive no further than is necessary to secure liberty by protecting the equal rights of each from aggression on the part of others, and the moment governmental prohibitions extend beyond this line they are in danger of defeating the very ends they are intended to serve.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS, BY HENRY GEORGE.

Henry George On Trade Restriction

From *The Advertiser*, Adelaide, South Australia,
March 4, 1939

IN "Protection or Free Trade" Henry George shows by illustration how absurd it is to expect a nation to benefit by placing restrictions against the free flow of commerce.

"To attempt to make a nation prosperous by preventing it from buying from other nations is as absurd as it would be to make a man prosperous by preventing him from buying from other men. How this operates in the case of the individual we can see from that practice which, since its application in the Irish land agitation, has come to be called "boycotting." Captain Boycott, upon whom has been thrust the unenviable fame of having his name turned into a verb, was in fact protected. He had a protective tariff of the most efficient kind built round him by a neighborhood decree more effective than Act of Parliament. No one would sell him labor, no one would sell him milk or bread or meat, or any service or commodity whatever. But instead of growing prosperous, this much-protected man had to fly from a place where his own market was thus reserved for his own productions. What protectionists ask us to do to ourselves in reserving our home market for home producers, is in kind what the Land Leaguers did to Captain Boycott. They ask us to boycott ourselves."

Henry George thus by a simple illustration demonstrates the absurdity of any nation being self-contained. During a war we blockade the ports of our alleged enemies and prevent goods from entering into their countries. This is supposed to be bad for our opponents. Yet in time of peace we blockade our own ports with tariff restrictions to prevent goods from coming into our country, and this is supposed to be beneficial to the people "sheltered" by the tariff wall. Where is the difference? Are not both acts "trade restrictions?"

REMOVAL OF TARIFF BARRIERS NOT SUFFICIENT

Free trade means more than the removal of tariff barriers. Before a person can trade he must have something to trade with. Before he can have this commodity he must produce it. Production means free access to land, and so long as land—the source of all wealth—is kept from those who desire to use it, we cannot logically say we have freedom of trade. Dealing with this aspect of the subject. Henry George said:—

"The mere abolition of protection—the mere substitution of a revenue tariff for a protective tariff—is such a lame and timorous application of the free-trade principle that it is a misnomer to speak of it as free trade. A revenue tariff is only a somewhat milder restriction on trade than a protective tariff.

"Free trade, in its true meaning, requires not merely the abolition of protection, but the sweeping away of all tariffs—the abolition of all restrictions (save those imposed in the interest of public health or morals) on the bringing of things into a country or the carrying of things out of a country.

"But free trade cannot logically stop at custom-houses. It applies as well to domestic as to foreign trade, and in its true sense requires the abolition of all internal taxes that fall on buying, selling, transporting or exchanging, on the making of any transaction or the carrying on of any business, save, of course, where the motive of the tax is public safety, health or morals.

"Thus the adoption of true free trade involves the abolition of all indirect taxation of whatever kind, and the resort to direct taxation for all public revenues.

"But this is not all. Trade, as we have seen, is a mode of production, and the freeing of trade is beneficial because it is a freeing of production. For the same reason, therefore, that we ought not to tax any one for adding to the wealth of a country by bringing valuable things into it, we ought not to tax anyone for adding to the wealth of a country by producing within that country valuable things. Thus the principle of free trade requires that we should not merely abolish all indirect taxes, but that we should abolish as well all direct taxes on things that are the produce of labor; that we should, in short, give full play to the natural stimulus to production—the possession and enjoyment of the things produced—by imposing no tax whatever upon the production, accumulation or possession of wealth (i.e., things produced by labor), leaving every one free to make exchange, give, spend or bequeath."

Professorial Simplicity

OUR attention has been called to a radio discussion of our economic plight and the cause thereof, in which discussion Prof. Irving Fisher participated. The honor of having the economic wisdom of this gentleman incorporated in the Congressional Record goes to Mr. Jerry Voorhis, Representative from California. The reader, we believe, will enjoy the following excerpts.

MR. VOORHIS. This particular broadcast took place on Tuesday, March 7, 1939, the guest speakers being Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, and Prof. Irving Fisher, professor emeritus of economics at Yale University, both of whom are depended upon in a great degree to guide our great Nation in the solving of its economic and social difficulties. . . .

RADIO DISCUSSION OVER WOL

MR. BINDERUP. . . . I introduce Prof. Irving Fisher, professor emeritus of economics at Yale University, from whose words and pen we have gleaned the plan for

constitutional money, Government monetary control, and in whose philosophy the Nation sees today the only hope for continued democracy. . . .

PROFESSOR FISHER. Years of study have convinced me that the depression has been primarily a monetary matter. The simple failure to have a sound and stable monetary system has been the most fundamental reason for business and bank failures, foreclosures, bankruptcies, and unemployment—in a word, for the depression. It was the depression, the pressure of starving and disillusioned men and women, which mainly caused and still causes the great world upheavals—economic, political, social, and even religious. . . .

Money has become a prime necessity in our civilization. Without it, goods cannot be sold and will not be produced. There may be crying need for the necessities of life; there may be all the iron, coal, lumber, and other raw materials used for manufacturing; there may be millions of able-bodied men anxious to work, yet, if there is no money there is no production; there is unemployment and starvation. . . .

If the banks loan freely so as to generate money, we have a boom. If there are few borrowers or if the banks do not wish to lend we have a depression. . . .

Fluctuations in the volume of our active money do great harm. Our check-book money shrank \$8,000,000,000 between 1929 and 1933, causing the great depression. That eight billions was more than a third of our money—more than a third of the Nation's purchasing power. How can we expect to buy the same amount of goods with two-thirds of our money? The restoration of a portion of this destroyed check-book money by Government borrowing from the banks made our partial recovery. A second destruction of check-book money in 1937 caused the recent recession while a second restoration is making a second partial recovery. [*sic*]

We should never have permitted the destruction of the vast sum of check-book money which was destroyed in 1929 to 1933. We should not have permitted the destruction of check-book money which caused the recent recession. These fluctuations of check-book money could not occur if there was 100 per cent real pocket-book money in the banks in our checking accounts—if the banks were not permitted to create this imaginary money—bank credit. That 100 per cent reserve was the original banking system. Banks did not create credit. They received for deposit actual cash and they loaned actual cash, but they loaned only the cash which was deposited in time deposits, and which were deposited for the specific purpose of being loaned by the bank. There were no low-reserve checking accounts in those days. All business was transacted with actual cash. Deposits of cash which the depositor expected to use in his business remained in the bank in cash at the disposal of the depositor. . . .

The banks now, as a system, hold cash and Government bonds equal to the total balances in the Nation's checking accounts—what we call demand deposits. If all these bonds were made instantly convertible into cash at the demand of the banks, the banks would now have, as a system, all their checking account balances in cash or its equivalent. A very simple law would preserve this desirable situation. Thereafter it would only be necessary for the Government to issue any additional money needed to promote full recovery. This would be in cash, which the Government would deposit in the banks and spend into circulation. If this is done, it is my belief that we shall never again see another depression like the 10-year depression which we have just had, and if this had been done 10 years ago we would never have had this depression at all. Senator Norris, if you will get such legislation enacted in the Senate and your fellow Congressmen at the other end of the Capitol will do their part, you will have accomplished, in my opinion, more for the good of your countrymen than has been accomplished by legislation for a generation. I take this opportunity to express my gratification that you are now adding this problem to the many which you have handled so successfully already.

Comment?—We're bewildered. It is all so simple, as the Professor says, but in the absence of anything that remotely resembles facts, in this day of trial, we are speechless.

THE mode of taxation is quite as important as the amount. As a small burden badly placed may distress a horse that could carry with ease a much larger one properly adjusted, so a people may be impoverished and their power of producing wealth destroyed by taxation, which, if levied in another way, could be borne with ease.—PROGRESS AND POVERTY, BY HENRY GEORGE.

A FREE COPY of LAND AND FREEDOM is an invitation to become a subscriber.

BOOK REVIEWS

GROUND UNDER OUR FEET: AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY
BY RICHARD T. ELY

330 pgs. Price \$3.00 The MacMillan Co., N. Y. City.

Richard T. Ely has been to the Georgeists almost as much of an "enfant terrible" as Hearst has been to the Communists. Perhaps a glance into the lives of our "enemies" would disarm us a little. For a biography—and especially an autobiography—reveals, after all, a human being with a typical human life-pattern. A perusal of Ely's account of himself in "Ground Under Our Feet" may dispose us more kindly toward him. For instance, he opens thus:

"I was born before the Civil War. I have witnessed a panorama of events which has thrilled, saddened, inspired and ever kindled in me a burning desire to set the world right. I have been guided in my efforts by the philosophy that "the beginning and end of all is man." In my youth I was branded a "radical" for saying things

which are today commonly accepted. This does not mean that the problems of the days of my youth have vanished. On the contrary, the conflicts raging today are essentially the same conflicts; between labor and capital, between government and industry; but they are being fought on a different plane. Technological advances have brought into view the possibility of abundance for all. Yet we do not have abundance for all. Therefore the battle rages between those who have and those who have not. Technological advances have resulted in a growing interdependence of human beings. Our economic relations are more and more closely interwoven, and more and more it is "one for all and all for one." Failure to act on this means disaster. If we apply ourselves intelligently and sanely to the problems of today we can look forward to a future worthy of man. If we unleash the forces of hatred, selfishness and brutality, we can look forward only to destruction."

Ely evidently has been motivated by high-minded purposes. Perhaps we should be more tolerant. But on the other hand, how can this man who wants to set the world right, this specialist in land economics, the very title of whose book suggests a prepossession with land—how can he dismiss Henry George's contribution to these problems so curtly?

"Because I was conscious of my own integrity, I could not see my way clear to advocate the Single Tax. For this reason, they thought that I must have lost my way; they suspected me of selling out to the interests, especially the real estate interests. The advocates of the Single Tax said, 'Here we have applied Christianity. Follow Henry George in his eloquent and moving plea for a new and better social order.' Yet it seemed to me that the natural rights doctrine of Henry George was thoroughly unscientific, a belated revival of the social philosophy of the eighteenth century. I believed that the economics underlying Henry George's pleas was unsound."

Let us admit a high-minded purpose. Let us refuse to question motives. But that stereotyped professorial slam—*that's* what rankles the Georgeists.

George's "panacea" was to Ely one of the many typical cases of "a false Christ who would arise, mislead the multitude and cause endless destruction."

Immediately after this "criticism" of George, Ely tells us that in casting about for wise guidance he found a great deal in the Mosaic legislation.

"In the Mosaic law, land was not to be regarded as a commodity, for the final ownership was God's. 'The land shall not be sold forever, for the land is mine.' It was to be used by the earthly owner for home and subsistence. Speculation in land, buying and selling for gain, was absolutely inconsistent with the spirit of the legislation. If poverty necessitated it, temporary possession could be given with widely extended rights of redemption."

[*Sic!*] Does George say more? But Ely catches himself in time: "Although these ideas are *sound in principle* (italics mine), they were never carried out. In modern complex society they could not be carried out any more than in primitive Israel [*sic*]. But, if we cannot apply these laws to the letter, we must aim at the spirit for which they stand. It will require our best brains, with all good will, and we must remember that 'the letter (of the law) killeth, the spirit giveth life.'"

What else is George's proposal to socialize the rent of land and permit the land itself to be used by individuals, but an application of the spirit of Moses to "modern complex society"? And how else would Ely prevent "speculation in land, buying and selling for gain?"

Ely's unsympathetic attitude toward George has its basis in his approach to economics. When he proposed the founding of the American Economic Association, in the 1880's, its central idea was to be "that the dogma of *laissez faire* should be abandoned by our leaders." His program "emphasized historical and statistical study rather than deductive speculation," which marked a decisive break with the classical school, and which he joyfully considered an "emancipation."

The written prospectus of the Association, however, did not suggest such a complete break, and Ely's colleague, S. N. Patten called it to his attention. Patten said, in effect: Why don't you admit it? We don't believe in the old-fashioned idea of freedom. "It seems to me that the very object of our association should be to deny the right of individuals to do as they please, and that of course is restricting trade." (Is this one of the things, radical in those days, but "which are today commonly accepted?")

Further on in the book, Ely tells us "I have always recognized that we do not have natural law in the economic world, and that economic laws are different from the laws of external nature." He groans at the slip he once made in comparing economic tendencies to the law of gravity. But he feels consoled because such great economists as Malthus and Walker also made the same mistake. Walker's error, it seems, was in considering Ricardo's law of the increase of rent a natural law. Ely informs us that as society grows "we have relative over-production, and we have a fall in land values and unearned decrements rather than unearned increments in the rent of land."

These assertions, I think, sufficiently explain why Ely does not feel favorably disposed toward George.

Later on, Ely founds the Institute for Research in Land Economics and Public Utilities. The motto is "Under All, The Land." In speaking of the aims of this Institute, Ely says, "The poverty that results from bad utilization of the land and that passes on from generation to generation is evident to every careful observer of what is taking place in city and country. Countless needless tragedies exist. They can be seen on every hand in the struggle of men who cultivate poor farm land and in every city in the efforts of men and women to pay for the land that in a generation will not be worth the price paid." (Unearned decrement!)

Apparently Ely sees no connection between poverty and bad utilization of land on the one hand, and a system that permits land monopoly and land speculation on the other. Still, the purpose of the Institute "is to join in the labors of those who are striving to abolish poverty and hope in time to achieve their purpose."

We earnestly suggest that Prof. Ely again read Henry George's works, with an unbothered mind; that is, forgetting for the moment that Georgeists and Ely do not mix, and keeping in mind that Henry George's works were undertaken for the same reason as his own, to eradicate poverty.

We hope that Prof. Ely will do this, and we will gladly hold our tongues the while.

ROBERT CLANCY.

NEW DANISH EDITION OF "PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

The fifth edition of "Progress and Poverty" in the Danish translation, by Prof. Jakob E. Lange, has been issued by Arnold Busck, publisher of Copenhagen, Denmark. The first edition came out in 1905 and including this latest issue, more than 10,500 copies have been produced. The first four editions were completely sold out making this fifth edition necessary.

In his introduction, written for his first edition, Prof. Lange tells us that his was not the first translation of "Progress and Poverty." In 1886, a translation by V. Ullman, High School principal, was published in Christiania and completely sold out. Prof. Lange adds a few words to the preface to this new edition. He states he has improved and revised his translation, that he may the more nearly achieve the clarity and richness of the original.

An interesting addition to this latest Danish version is the reproduction on the front and back folds of the cover, of facsimiles of the title pages of "Progress and Poverty" as issued in the following countries, to wit: Hungary, Bulgaria, China, Holland, Finland and Spain. We regret our inability to mention the titles in the various languages because the type necessary to do so is not readily available to us.—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

STATE OF WAR PERMANENT UNLESS—

BY LOUIS WALLIS

Doubleday, Doran Co., N. Y. C. 96 pp., Price \$1.00

Mr. Wallis has added some chapters to his little volume "Safeguard Productive Capital," and brought the subject out in a new book entitled, "State of War Permanent Unless . . ."

The new part precedes the former work and contains some very apt remarks on the present state of the so-called "civilized world." Mr. Wallis deals mainly with conditions of the present in England and Germany, with the danger of war hanging over Europe. His keen, vivacious, interesting style carries the reader with him. Some of his statements are worth emphasizing, in contrast to the egregious errors that even our best dailies are making nowadays. Mr. Wallis, for instance, does not rave about "Old Czecho-Slovakia" as if it had existed since the world began, but says:

"The Czecho-Slovak Republic was created by Britain and France not for the purpose of promoting democracy, but in order to blockade the expansion of Germany eastward. Its origin had nothing to do with moral principles; and no appeal to moral principles has been made in the disruption of the little state."

The sound common-sense of that remark deserves wide recognition. Another telling truth in Mr. Wallis' book is:

"The time has passed when the aristocracy of any land in Europe can wage war by conscripting youth and levying taxes upon the people at large in the name of 'patriotism'."

And still another sentence is worthy of note:

"It is not the dictators themselves that the world has to deal with primarily, but the economic problems which produce dictatorship."

These thoughts alone make the new form of the book valuable to all readers who would understand the true problems that face civilization today.—G. I. C.

PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

IS ECONOMICS A SCIENCE?

BY L. D. BECKWITH, 1325 E. POPLAR ST., STOCKTON, CAL.

We have just received, in pamphlet form, the first thirty sections of what the author intends to develop into a text-book on the above entitled subject. Mr. Beckwith, publisher of "No Taxes" and the author of the work, states that the pamphlets are for free distribution. Inviting his readers to find, if they can, any weak links in his argument, he says:

"If the teachings of this book stand up under the criticism that will be directed against them and they are accepted, the greatest revolution in thought the world has ever known will result; for that will mean that men will have to change completely their present approach to problems involving their policies in civics, politics, industry and statecraft, and in pedagogy and in character-building."

Mr. Beckwith's cardinal point is that

"we can have wholesome civic conditions, honest politics, democratic government, social justice, racial harmony, and international peace, just as we have good automobiles, good airplanes, and good radios—without waiting for men to reform or be reformed."

Editor Beckwith has our best wishes in this undertaking.

UNWISE TAXATION AS A BURDEN ON HOUSING

BY HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM. PRICE 10 CENTS

Order from Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 32 E. 29th St., N. Y. C.

Mr. Buttenheim, Editor of the *American City*, is to be complimented for this painstaking and scholarly work of 20 pages, now appearing under separate cover, having been reprinted from the *Yale Law Journal* for December, 1938. Besides being chock full of information particularly useful to Georgists, it stands out as a nicely

balanced treatment of the ethical, fiscal and practical aspects of the subject, supplemented by interesting notes, figures and references, all interspersed with an appropriate humor. We quote the initial paragraphs:

The epitaph of one Rebecca Bogess, who died in Folkestone, England, on August 22, 1688, tells of the satisfaction of the deceased with her new "house" where the landlord could never raise the rent, and concludes:

"From chimney-tax this cell is free,
"To such a house who would not tenant be?"

When England imposed the chimney-tax from which Rebecca could escape only by death, and when, in the reign of William III, a tax was imposed on two or more panes of glass in a window, the lawmakers were doubtless seeking new sources of public revenues rather than methods of preventing the attainment of decent housing by the British people. The intent, however, did not alter the effect: chimneys became fewer, and windows smaller. Healthful, liveable housing was handicapped.

Were it now proposed to revive these ancient English levies, the unwisdom of so doing would be recognized by all. But we are still taxing chimneys and windows in our American cities. We are also taxing doors and walls and roofs and stairs and the other parts of our homes. We no longer pick on the chimneys or windows for a special tax, but the tax-gatherer levies on the whole building. When a bathroom or a porch is added, up goes the tax—though any suggestion of taxing bathrooms or porches as such would be laughed out of court. It is to be doubted whether we have really progressed very far in this matter of taxation since William III and the seventeenth century.

We highly recommend the reading of "Unwise Taxation as a Burden on Housing." Copies of it should be in the hands of everyone interested in better housing.

PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND EXPLAINED

BY SPENCER HEATH

We are in receipt of a pamphlet from the pen of Spencer Heath, of Elkridge, Maryland. Much of it serves a useful purpose of enlightenment on the sinister aspects of permitting politicians to impose taxes for the disservices they "render" in addition to real economic services. We confess, however, to a failure to appreciate Mr. Heath's proprietary land ownership ideas. The article, however, is couched in scholarly fashion and we believe can be read with profit.

Correspondence

FROM THE EDITOR OF *COMMONWEAL*

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I know you will be pleased to see the enclosed first number of the new Volume of *Commonweal*.

It has not been an easy matter to struggle through these last four years of enforced silence, but we have done so, and now make a fresh bid for circulation in the interests of the Cause.

If those who really appreciated the *Commonweal* in the past will now come promptly to its side, then there is, I think, a good prospect of putting it upon a non-losing basis at an early date. What we want now is to have all who would wish to receive the weekly issues send in their order without delay, and we will do the rest.

Under separate cover I send you a few copies that you may bring same before the notice of persons likely to be interested.

J. W. GRAHAM PEACE.

6 The Close, Rayners Lane, Pinner, Middlesex, England.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

For several years, the writer has sought to interest his fellow Georgists, as well as the Housing Authority of our government in the economic reform which the general use of demountable structures would promote. The response was practically nil. They stood mute before the suggestion that a solution of the housing problem could be achieved through the mass production of small dwellings, so designed that they could be erected upon leased acres, and dismantled and removed when necessary, at slight expense. So we have gone on our squandering way, building structures which were

spawned in Central Europe by the Lake Dwellers, four or five hundred generations ago.

But, someone else has seen the star. Out in Fort Wayne, the local housing authority has discovered that through the use of inexpensive factory-made, demountable houses it is possible to provide adequate shelter for the underpaid, homeless families of that city. Their plan should interest all followers of Henry George. The land speculator receives no profit, and the home is tax-exempt, and a rental of \$2.50 per week gives the family a four-room cottage, with all necessary conveniences. The manner in which sites are obtained is unique. The housing authority purchases city lots at \$1.00 each, giving the owner the option to repurchase his lot, at the same price any time after the expiration of one year. Owners of hundreds of unsaleable lots have welcomed the opportunity to relieve themselves of the necessity to pay further taxes on these lots, until there is a market for them. Presumably, the real estate boys out there are having a good chuckle over their cleverness in getting the State to carry their speculation for them, but the State will have the last laugh, for few, if any, of these lots will ever be repurchased by any individual. Every family domiciled in one of these demountable structures removes one prospective customer from the real estate market, thereby lessening the probability of future sale of our vacant city lots. As the economy of this method of housing becomes apparent, other cities will institute similar programmes, and a greater number of families will be provided for.

The Fort Wayne Project is, however, merely a beginning. The demonstration they are providing will receive the attention of all prospective home owners. The bulk of our home builders are those men whose salary permits them to buy and pay for a \$1,000 lot and a \$5,000 dwelling. When they discover that they can obtain a better dwelling for \$2,500 and can erect it upon an acre or two of land for a few dollars per year, there can be little doubt as to what their choice will be. City lots will then become a drug on the market, but our good old Single Taxer will say, "What is the difference, rent will go up in the country and absorb any expected gain." Is this true? Have you given any thought to the matter? Is there or is there not sufficient land lying within commuting distance of our present centers of population to give several times the number of families who might wish it a small subsistence homestead of this kind? If there is such a plethora of sites, how will the few that are put into use be able to demand increased rent while the remaining sites lay unused and vacant?

Erie, Michigan.

ROBERT L. MCCAIG.

COMMENT ON ABOVE BY HENRY J. FOLEY

Editor's Note.—A similar letter was written by Mr. McCaig to Mr. Henry J. Foley, wherein was added the statement that in the Fort Wayne project they are using small demountable structures upon tax exempt lots. Mr. Foley comments as follows:

In the first place, if the Fort Wayne programme is to build on "tax exempt lots," that is in violent opposition to the entire plan of Henry George. All the taxes would have to be collected on improvements and on production, a worse condition than now, when at least some of the government expenses are paid by land rent.

I doubt if the demountable structure would ever be possible on a large scale in our civilization. Organization and centralization are the natural progress of mankind. It means society. The demountable structure is a return to the civilization of the wandering Arab and the American Indian, and to their life of hardships.

There are many hundreds of thousands who could never leave their present locations to settle in outlying territory. I am a teacher, and I could not adopt the Fort Wayne programme unless I left my job and started life over again, with nothing to start on. Whereas, if Single Tax were put into effect I should have absolutely nothing to do differently except to keep all my salary to live on, instead of seeing it melt into house taxes, income taxes, sales taxes, and a hundred other taxes.

Even if the entire population lived in demountable houses, we still could not get the Single Tax until we could secure laws to collect land rents instead of taxes, which is exactly what we shall have to do with or without the demountable plan.

The only problem before Single Taxers is to induce government to live on the rent of its land instead of on taxes; and the only way in which we shall ever put over this programme is to let the people know that the collection of land rent by individuals is robbery, that the collection of taxes is an additional robbery, and that this double robbery is the plain and sufficient explanation of poverty, unemployment and depression.

New York City.

HENRY J. FOLEY.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Our committee on National Organization was organized to unify the Single Taxers of the country to get a measure of Single Tax in one state with a united force.

What have we got?

The committee selected Michigan without asking the Single Taxers of the country their opinion of the best state, though they would be asked to contribute to the work. The people of Michigan can make the necessary change in their tax laws for taxing land value more but only with the approval of the legislature. This should exclude Michigan as our field of team work.

Now there is a group of Single Taxers in Ohio that propose to launch a campaign in that state though the constitution of the state expressly prohibits the use of the initiative for the Single Tax. I am not a lawyer but it appears to me they would be compelled first to repeal this prohibitive clause to get a land value measure on the ballot. So we will be wasting our time and funds in these two states.

For years we have repeatedly had a land value tax measure on the ballot in California. The previous highest vote for it was 160,000. In 1938 this was increased to 372,000 though there were 24 other measures on the ballot. The people there are more social minded and this makes it a good state for our measure. Then the state sends to each voter the amendment with the sponsors' reason for it and the opponents' reason for its rejection. What has been done there is a distinct advancement and it is important we continue to build on it until we complete the structure. The landed and other privileged groups there fear it as nowhere else and they must have a reason for their fear. This fear by its opponents should cause us for the same reason the greatest encouragement.

There should be no retreat from California!

St. Louis, Mo.

E. H. BOECK.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your last issue is a letter from L. D. Beckwith, in which he makes an attempt to defend the ethics of interest. As he carefully abstains from any definition of interest and has never at any time given the law which fixes the rate of returns, it is not easy to tell what he is talking about. I have in my possession an article by him in which he repudiates the definition of interest, "as the payment for the use of borrowed wealth," stating that, this was usury and unjust. Yet in his letter he states that if an infant is left sufficient wealth and it be loaned on interest, he might live to old age without working, for the interest he receives comes out of the use of his capital, though it is without any labor of his; yet if he owns the capital he is entitled to the interest. He also hazards the guess that the division between labor and capital, after rent was paid would be fifty-fifty. Still he gives no hint of any law governing the division.

Now for the ethics. He admits the Bible condemns interest, but he says that the Bible is not a textbook of science. In other words God who ordained the laws governing the distribution of wealth arranged them so as to conflict with his laws of justice and righteousness as laid down in his book. Beckwith evidently does not under-

stand that the distribution of wealth is a matter of morals and answers the question "Who ought to get it?"

The Bible teaches us that the fundamental law of society is "Thou shalt not steal." It was given to Adam and Eve in Eden and amplified at Sinai, for the ten commandments simply apply the principle of respect for the rights of others, both God's and man's.

What is stealing? It is the taking of the things which belong to another without his consent and without a fair equivalent.

According to Beckwith it is quite ethical for any one who can get a surplus, no matter how obtained, to collect a return from the labors of others, in perpetuity by lending on interest, and he calls his philosophy a science. And claims to be the only true and scientific Georgeist in the world. Funny, is it not?

The cause of interest is the fact that wealth saved can buy land that will yield the purchaser a net revenue over all taxes on it.

And so long as such unearned incomes are for sale, the wealth by which they can be bought will command a similar return. When we collect all our ground rent for public expenses there will be no incomes obtainable without labor. Thus the laws of economics will be found to harmonize with the ethics of the Bible, as in fact they must, as they arise from the same source and authority.

Toronto, Ont.

ALAN C. THOMPSON.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Never were words more truly spoken, than was stated in your Jan.-Feb. number on "Some Thoughts on Organization." In the early days of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, some of our bright men who were seeking political preferment decided to join the major political party organizations to "work from within" and there were many who did. As soon as a comfortable berth was secured they did not hesitate to oppose any stand that would really advance the cause of the "Land for the People," for fear it would hurt them in their affiliation and security in the organization to which they were indebted for their jobs. I could mention at least ten names of men who were rewarded by being made candidates for various elective offices, who represented to their party leaders that they could be assured of the votes of members of the M. S. T. Club, not only for themselves but also for the entire party ticket.

Of course, there were many members of the M. S. T. Club in those early days who were averse to any alliance with these plunderers. The sole and only purpose for Single Taxers to enter politics should be to battle for the "Land for the People" and to advocate taking the entire rent of land and the abolishment of all taxes. But no alliances with any political organization.

New York City

M. VAN VEEN.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Reading Van Doren's "Life of Benjamin Franklin," I am so much struck with this passage (p. 705) that he gave to the French people when about to return to the U. S. A. after his long sojourn in France, who inquired about America, that I think you can perhaps quote it in your next issue. "The chief resource of America is cheap land, made so by the vast forests still void of inhabitants and not likely to be occupied in an age to come. Not till the lands are taken up and cultivated and the excess of people who cannot get land thrown out of employment would there be any great poverty in America. For the present, labor was still well paid. Skilled artisans could make a good living and provide for children and old age. Farm laborers could save their wages and become farmers."

New York City

CHARLOTTE SCHETTER.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The job for Single Taxers is not to quibble over what will happen to interest or other side issues but to concentrate on pushing the Single Tax on the location value of land.

It is evident from reading the papers that the people are at last becoming tax conscious and I think now is the time for Single Taxers

to form a letter-writing corps and write letters to the papers telling the advantages of Single Tax.

New Bedford, Mass.

R. A. SCOTT.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

THE contention that the political method is the wrong approach to our Single Tax reform took an awful jolt when the Mooney decision in California was made. John Public was well educated in regards to the details for more than a dozen years, but until political action seated a governor who would perform the necessary act, nothing was done. The old boy could have remained there forever waiting for the education of the public to free him.

Trenton, N. J.

THOMAS J. PURVIS.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

ANOTHER of the "Old Guard" has passed to his reward. George R. Macey, prominently identified with the Single Tax movement ever since "Progress and Poverty" was first put on the counters of book-stores, entered eternal rest on January 27, 1939. He had passed his 90th birthday. He resided with his daughter, Mrs L. Marian Kapp of 155 Lockwood Ave., New Rochelle, New York, who survives him. George R. Macey ever remained a loyal follower of the Cause. It was he who first induced Henry George to publish his works in such form as to enable the multitude to obtain the books cheaply. As a result Mr. Macey organized The Sterling Publishing Co. at 77 South Fifth Ave. (later to become known as West Broadway) in the City of New York. The Sterling Publishing Co. made the books available at 25 cents the copy. They also published many tracts and pamphlets. Not long after, John J. Lovell became the publisher of George's books at the popular price of 10 cents each. George R. Macey was the Candidate for President of the Board of Aldermen in the early 20's Campaign of the Commonwealth Land Party. For many years the Editor of LAND AND FREEDOM appreciated and had the benefit of George R. Macey's acute power of discernment, and his co-operation in the work on this publication. Also, theirs was a friendship covering many years of active work in behalf of the Single Tax. Mr. Macey was a close friend of the George family and particularly of Richard, who was Henry George's second son.

WE wish to acknowledge the receipt of a letter from our old friend and faithful correspondent, Mr. Frank G. Anderson of Jamestown, New York. Mr. Anderson is one of the "old war-horses, who saw the cat" long ago and took an active part in the campaign of 1886. Though on his next birthday he will be eighty-two years young, he is still "on the job." Among his converts to the Cause, he numbers his son-in-law, Mr. Ernest C. Kessler, who has recently shown his interest by writing a letter to the Mayor of the City of New York, a copy of which we received from Mr. Anderson, as follows:

February 15, 1939

Honorable Mayor Fiorella LaGuardia

New York City

Dear Sir:

I was very much interested last week to listen by radio to the panel discussion that you carried on with members of the Brooklyn High School regarding the housing problem. Their questions were very interesting and showed a real interest and serious thought regarding the matter. However, I was very much hoping that one idea would come out of this, but this did not seem to appear.

For many years I have been a firm believer in the Henry George Doctrine of Taxation known as the Single Tax and, of course, you are very familiar with this and very likely familiar with the personal life of the great man Henry George. In the writer's opinion, our present system of taxation has developed into more or less of a grab bag plan, simply putting taxes on where it is most easy to procure them. Regardless of the fact that many of our great men in this

country are Single Taxers at heart, they lack the courage to take a stand and make a fight for their principles. I was really amazed that with all the bright minds of those young people who entered into this panel discussion that someone did not touch this phase of the matter.

We all know very well that taxes will always have to be paid in this country and the average fair-minded person, I believe, is willing to pay his share. If most of our taxes were collected and based on this site value of land, which is the basis of wealth as produced in this country, we would get away from these multitudinous taxes that are being collected with so much inequality and, of course, I believe that the gradual adoption of the Single Tax system would be the answer to better housing and would eliminate most of our economic disorders.

I know that you are a very busy man, but certainly would appreciate an expression from you concerning this most vital subject.

Very sincerely yours,

ERNEST C. KESSLER.

We have not heard whether or not a reply was received by Mr. Kessler from the Mayor. We are, however, thoroughly satisfied that Mr. Kessler, too, has "seen the cat" and that Mr. Anderson has just cause to be proud of his son-in-law and disciple. To Mr. Kessler we say "Keep it up, you are doing fine."

The Denver Post, Denver, Colo., claims 100,000 readers. About two-thirds of a page in each issue is devoted to a feature known as "The Denver Post Open Forum," which is edited by our old friend and correspondent, Mr. Oscar O. Whitenack. Neither the newspaper, nor the Forum portion of it, claim any Georgeist affiliation. The manner in which the Forum is carried out, is by a "message" to the public, initialed by O. O. W. (the editor) conveying his thoughts on topics of the day, or historical incidents, and very frequently on philosophy and economics. Mr. Whitenack has succeeded, in that way, to raise questions which brought to the fore real George doctrine. His "leader", about 500 words, accompanied by his photo, starts the Forum off and on its way. The balance of the page contains letters "To the Open Forum," from its readers who either agree or disagree with the Editor, or, may start a new "fight" about anything they may have in mind. Underneath each published letter appears an "Editor's Note" which aims to clarify, or reply to the correspondent.

Scanning, as we did, a batch of these pages, we take pleasure in extending our sincerest best wishes to Mr. Whitenack, for the great job he is doing. One of his messages starts off with, "Why should any man be compelled to ask another for a job?" followed by the only answer, and in a rather unique manner and style, such as would only be advanced by Georgeists. Nearly every issue contains one and often more letters from correspondents, openly advocating the adoption of the philosophy of Henry George. "Well done" we say to Mr. Whitenack, and more power to the great work he is doing.

JOAN MARY HAMBURGER enters a very neat protest in opposition to those who advocate the establishment of a thirteen-month year. She does not seem to be on very good terms with her landlord and adds: "My dislike for him is so intense that it takes a full month to recuperate from the terrible ordeal of having to hand him the rent check civilly. Why in the name of humanity and justice should anyone be so cruel and hard-hearted as to suggest that I see my hated enemy an extra time each year?"

Maybe its just too much landlord that bothers Joan so much. We would assure her that she commands our deepest sympathy.

We were greatly interested in the copy of a letter which Mr. Theodore Buehler, Jr., of Alma, Wisc., wrote to the editor of *The United States News* of Washington, D. C. Mr. Buehler is the Editor of a Wisconsin country weekly newspaper, published in Alma. A communication from one editor to another, deserves professional respect.

He suggests that space be offered in *The United States News* to such eminent thinkers as Dr. John Dewey of Columbia University, Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown of the University of Missouri, and other well known and capable students of taxation. Mr. Buehler evidently has been reading the series of articles on taxation appearing in that paper, which have also been syndicated and published in other newspapers and he says: "In my estimation, too many tax experts and economists persist in hitting beside the mark." He sent several pamphlets to the good editor for his edification. Good editors can hardly afford to continue to ignore the great truth.

We are indebted for the following to Grace Isabel Colbron to whom Mr. Vedel was well known:

"The death of Anders Vedel in Denmark deprives the active Danish movement of one of its best fighters. Vedel, at his death a month ago Principal of the People's High School of Krabbesholm, had been for more than twenty years a convinced believer in Henry George, an active worker in the cause, a good speaker, and an agreeable personality whose alert mind and pleasant manner held audiences and helped him spread the message effectively. For many years he had been in the Faculty of several of the famous Danish People's High Schools, first in Odense, at Jacob Lange's School, then in Roskilde, where he was made principal, and finally, again principal, at the beautiful Krabbesholm High School. It was in these schools where first Jakob Lange, then Anders Vedel worked, that the study of land value taxation was taken officially into the curriculum.

Anders Vedel was equally effective as writer and as speaker, as able to talk in English, German or French as in his own tongue. At my first meeting with him, in Copenhagen in 1919, he was then living in that city and active in the work there, and he impressed me as just the type who could be of great help in the Cause. A tall, active blonde man, looking much younger than he was, his sincerity of conviction, and his ability to think clearly and to help others to think, made him the type of Georgeist one does not easily forget. Although all sane and sensible Scandinavia shuddered when the terms of the iniquitous Treaty of Versailles became known that summer of 1919, it was possibly Anders Vedel who put the crime most clearly in words that cut—and who most clearly saw the consequences under which the world is now suffering.

All those of us here who have met him, either in Denmark or at one or the other of the European International Conferences, will join our Danish comrades in mourning his loss."

DR. AND MRS. S. VERE PEARSON of England, now visiting in the United States, were tendered an informal reception and tea by Mrs. Anna George deMille, at her home, March 25. A group of sixty attended and listened to an interesting talk by Dr. Pearson, one of the leading Single Taxers today in England. He stressed mainly the point that the menace to the Philosophy of Henry George is the socialistic attitude which underlies the so-called British Liberals, and that the Labor Party has by now assumed a war-like psychology. Dr. Pearson warned us that socialism is our "stone wall" and that it is regrettable it was not actively fought against twenty years ago in England and America. He was impressed with the freedom of invidious thought and the educational work of the HGSSS, and cautioned us that the only solution is "education—education—and more education" so that we do not make the grave mistake of kow-towing to the political parties, which seems to have been the error made by the British Georgeists, with the outstanding exception of Sir Josiah Wedgwood, who is a Single Taxer independently of his political affiliations. Dr. Pearson said he keeps actively in touch with the Georgeists in the United States through correspondence. He stressed the deplorable fact that England cannot boast of the great advances made in many of the important American cities where the assessments of land and building values are separated for purposes of taxation and appreciated that the credit for this advance is due to the great work of American Single Taxers.

The Henry George School in England does not, according to Dr. Pearson, have the strong unity of purpose as in the United States, and there have been two schools of thought, causing a division of activities, which he regards as unfortunate. During a question and answer period, following the talk, Dr. Pearson indicated his appraisal of Mr. Chamberlain, Lloyd George, and other British statesmen, explaining that the background of Mr. Chamberlain, a family always engaged in the manufacture of armaments, has a good deal to account for his attitudes, and that Lloyd George, always an opportunist, was willing to ally his name with that of Henry George when it suited his purpose to do so.

Dr. Pearson, a physician, is an author of papers and books, dealing with disease and slums. His works include papers on "Tuberculosis and Land Values" and "Malaria and Slums." In 1935 he published a book "Growth and Distribution of Population," which was well received in England, and was brought out in this country by John Wiley & Co. Irrespective of topic or title, the doctor ever faithfully includes the Simon-pure doctrine of Henry George as the one and only cure for the cause and persistence of slums.

At the time of its publication it was reviewed in *LAND AND FREEDOM* by Jos. Dana Miller, who at that time pointed out that this book was among the rare ones which the late Cardinal Hayes of New York City commented on most favorably, and recommended its reading.

His newest book, entitled "London's Overgrowth," is momentarily expected to be marketed by C. W. Daniel, the London publishers. This book, with a title perhaps more suitable to the American public, will shortly be brought out as an American Edition by John Wiley & Co., and will have for its title, "Swollen Cities." We will anxiously await its appearance for review.

We are obliged to chronicle the passing of George Hughes, late of Topeka, Kansas, on February 27, 1939, at 1324 Medford Ave., that City. Mrs. Hughes, two sons and a daughter survive him.

Mr. Hughes, son of a famous English author, came to America as a young man, and learned to love America and its ways. He liked to refer to himself as having been born with a silver spoon in his mouth, but loving his fellow men far more than the traditions of the station to which he was born. No greater proof of such an observation was needed than the routine of his every-day deeds.

First and foremost, of course, George Hughes was interested in the philosophy of Henry George. But along with this love, Mr. Hughes loved any movement which had for its objective the uplift of the down trodden and under-privileged.

Old-timers will recall how George Hughes, scholar and gentleman that he was, devoted many evenings to attendance at the meetings of the Topeka Federation of Labor and its predecessor, the Industrial Council. He would sit patiently through a long session of routine business, apparently as interested as the members directly involved. And then, when called upon under the order of "good and welfare," as he invariably was, he found only good things to say about organized labor, at the same time getting in a few rapier thrusts designed to make the leaders squirm. The philosophy of George was always injected.

Topeka will miss George Hughes. No kindlier gentleman ever lived.

We are indeed grieved to learn of the passing of our very good friend, Edward B. Swinney, on February 23, 1939, at his residence, 238 So. Lorraine Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. He is survived by his wife, Mabel V., a daughter, Mrs. Virginia Johnson, and three sons, Howard V., Edward B., and Robert F. Swinney.

Mr. Swinney, until several years ago, was associated in the City of New York with John R. Waters in the Reciprocal Underwriters of N. Y. He was in the insurance business the greater part of his business career and upon his retirement went to California to make his home.

Though sixty-nine years of age at the time of his passing, he devoted a great deal of energy during his retirement from active

business to the cause of the Single Tax. He was recognized as a pamphleteer of importance. He was a staunch and devoted friend of *LAND AND FREEDOM*.

WE have just learned of the death of Edwin J. Jones, though it took place as far back as May 12, 1938. Mr. Jones, a resident of Westfield, N. J., was an ardent worker for the Cause and a valued correspondent. Among others, he wrote an article appearing some years ago in *LAND AND FREEDOM* wherein he traced this nation's history with respect to several Federal laws for the raising of revenue by land value taxation alone.

WHEN it comes to speeches and letter writing in furtherance of the movement, Harry Weinberger, well known Georgeist and New York attorney, is a veritable human dynamo. We have before us several copies of letters he has sent to such leaders of thought as President and Mrs. Roosevelt, Town Hall of the Air Broadcasting Company, and the editors of various publications. Of course, his Georgeist arguments are unanswerable. We take this opportunity to record our esteem for his unflinching devotion and enterprise.

UNDER date of February 12, 1939, Mr. Vernon J. Rose advises us of the great loss sustained by the Kansas City, Mo., Georgeists in the sudden death of A. E. Swearingen. "He had been for thirty-five years one of the most understanding, tireless, and winning advocates of the Georgeist philosophy we ever had among us. He was a man of great activity and amazingly wide interests. He was active in his church; a leader in Boy Scout work, active in the Humane Society and in the American Legion. He lost a son in the Great War, and Hewitt Swearingen Post here was named for him. He died suddenly of a heart attack while attending a social function of the Post. He was sixty-eight years of age." Mr. Rose further adds that: "He was one of the original sponsors of the Henry George School here, and a generous contributor to its support. We chose him as president of the Sponsors and called him the 'Dean,' and he took great interest in our cause."

WE are advised that Representative J. J. Daily has introduced in the Missouri legislature a joint and concurrent resolution to submit a Constitutional Amendment to the people providing for separate classification and assessment of real property—land and improvements; also providing that the assessment of improvements shall be decreased twenty per cent each year for five years, and the assessment of land values be correspondingly increased, frankly stating the purpose to be to exempt improvements entirely in five years after adoption.

FRED PEASE of Milk River, Alberta, Canada, has sent us in mimeograph form an interesting chart to illustrate his conception of the operation of the natural laws of distribution of wealth. He states that with its use he has had encouraging success with the average Henry George student. He adds, however, that to many Georgeists it does not appear to correctly portray the subject.

CHARLES LISCHER of St. Louis, Mo., one of our pioneer Single Taxers, is dead. Like the falling leaves our old faithful workers are leaving their life task in the cause to meet the muster roll that Henry George said "would be called some where—some time."

"He saw a purpose in all things. An order in the universe. He had faith and he worked for the fundamental laws that govern men's welfare. He possessed a free mind without the shackles that keep so many in the dark. While he did not live to see the glory of a world governed by the natural law, he did enjoy the glory of striving for its attainment."

The above tribute was written by an old subscriber, E. H. Boeck.—Editor.