

tionality. And finally the condition of a mendicant mentality fit only for a dictatorship, and the death of democracy!

THERE can be no objection to any group of workers, labor unions or others, establishing old age pensions, life insurance, or pensions in cases of sickness or disability. That is something which concerns them alone. Our criticism is directed against that attitude of mind which looks to the employer as under any moral obligation to pay any kind of pension to the employees. This is purely a gratuity and should be so regarded. It tends to confuse the nature of wages and obscures the character of contract between employers and employed. How much of even voluntary insurance schemes would seem necessary or advisable when the community value of land is publicly absorbed and ready at hand to provide for emergencies, is a matter of conjecture.

THAT will change everything. Pensions from this source would assume the character of public obligation. Employers owe nothing to their workers save their wages and fair treatment. The trouble is that economic conditions being what they are destroy all true perspective. The habit of regarding capital as the payer of wages, and the consequent subordination of labor to capital under present conditions, seems to justify these gratuities. They seem to justify government pensions, bonuses, benefactions out of private fortunes, and all the multitude of crazy notions that seem further to accentuate the unnatural dependence of the workers, who are really justified in demanding only one thing—freedom of access to the natural resources of the earth!

TARIFFS conduce to the same habit of subserviency. But in a civilization such as ours it is idle to talk as Hoover does of "rugged individualism." Have the workers not been persuaded that they need protection? They have been taught for several generations that they are not able to take care of themselves, and it ill becomes a spokesman for the party of protection to talk of rugged individualism or individualism of any other kind.

AFTER several generations of "infant industries" Americans are still infants. It is impossible to imagine a more helpless population. Apparently we are at the mercy of every other people. Once it was England, then it was Germany, now it is Japan. We are subjected to the competition of these malevolent powers. We have faced the depression in the same spirit. Regarding it as a natural calamity, we have turned, not to our own resources, and our own resolution to overcome it, but to government.

IT is the same habit of our ancestors who prayed to the sun, against drought or for more abundant harvests.

And the belief that some miraculous powers were lodged in government is the outgrowth of this spirit of dependence. Man is impressed with the sense of his own helplessness. He is being destroyed by the systems, political and economic, which he has created.

THERE was a time when Americans stood erect. Perhaps, almost certainly, this brave attitude of mind was an unconscious reflex of the knowledge that there were great frontiers which beckoned them, the easy access to this land and the right to work that was open to them. With the gradual closing of these frontiers, they were easy victims of a mendicant political economy in which they were taught that they must be helped by government. They still cherished the stupidity voiced in many Fourth of July orations of the "dignity of labor," about which they prated and to which conditions everywhere visible opposed a blank denial.

JAPAN wants more room, which means more land. Hence the danger of war. We are told by Prof. Jesse Holmes of Swarthmore College that Japan is "terribly overcrowded, terribly poor." But who is crowding her? There is no question that any country, Japan included, with equality of land distribution, is able to support its existing population. Japan is in the position of being out-distanced in the business of land gambling—"a belated bandit," Prof. Holmes calls her. But if nobody were crowding her she would not be giving the impression of being overcrowded, and that is true of every country. Landowners are doing the crowding. Prof. Holmes calls all nations "bandits," which is a pretty accurate description, though he does not quite sense the reason for it all.

THE curious misunderstanding about "overcrowded" nations is very persistent, despite the fact that it has no basis in fact or arithmetic. Even Frank H. Simonds, who has done some clear thinking on international questions, says that the way to avoid war would be for the nations rich in natural resources to divide up in order to live in peace in a normal world. He sees that it is hunger for land that causes war. He is not very clear about it. He does not see that what is the matter with "overcrowded nations" is that land owners are doing the crowding. If a nation has not enough of the things it needs it can share in the natural resources of the world by letting down the barriers to freedom of exchange.

INTERNATIONAL wars and civil wars alike—most of them—have their basis in land or tariffs. They are shooting down peasants in Spain, of whom there are some three million, because the promise of agrarian reforms were not kept. The peasants who were shot down were called "anarchists"—a convenient term. Men who protest against conditions will always be called anarchists

or communists. What do their crazy theories matter? The only dreadful fact that is obvious enough is that men are hungry and that they will revolt and fight to satisfy their hunger. They are divorced from the land and that is the sole reason they are hungry. They have no place to work and land is a place to work.

LOOK where we will the conflict is the same. Paraguay is fighting to secure the petroleum fields of Bolivia. The Chaco war is a fight for land—oil fields are land. Not that it really matters to the native Paraguayan worker who owns the petroleum fields—he never will. And that is one of the mysteries of the matter explainable only by the unfathomable ignorance of man. Paraguayans and Bolivians hate each other, kill each other, over land they will never have any right to own. If they were going to get the land for themselves there would be some sense in it. But whoever owns the oil-fields, Paraguayans and Bolivians will work for the owners as miserable slaves, as they always did.

THE Ukraine is a great wheat country and produces more iron and coal than all of France. Germany has long cast envious eyes upon it. Hitler's book, *Mein Kampf*, hints at the seizure of the Ukraine. Germany would gladly go to war to secure it. Land again as the urge to war. Italian imperialism rushes more and definitely into Ethiopia where there are vast natural resources.

IT is always land or tariffs that are the cause of war. It is news that has not yet got into the news that West Australia is anxious to secede from the Australian Commonwealth because of the high tariff taxation of the Canberra Government. It is even hinted that West Australia with half a million people is willing to take up arms to enforce its demand if it should be refused. King George and the British Parliament have been petitioned for permission to secede. If the petition is not granted a peaceful withdrawal is to be put to a referendum of the people of West Australia. Either the tariff must be abolished or greatly lowered. In the *San Francisco News* its correspondent Sam Ewing has interviewed one of the leading business men of Perth, West Australia, who said: "I do not mean to predict in advance what the vote will be. But it is a matter of life and death with us. My state is agricultural. It sells products in the world market. The eastern Australian states have the power to enforce a high protective tariff for the protection of their infant industries. The tax is too much of a burden on our farming community." This presents a very interesting situation. And it can easily lead to civil war. Again let it be said, and it cannot be said too often, that the two causes of war—one a primary and the other a secondary cause—are the private ownership of natural resources and hostile tariffs.

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE at a meeting at Fraunces' Tavern in this city on April 17 is reported to have said: "Under the machine age there will be a certain economic wastage; we must take care of that wastage, not only in giving them food, shelter and clothing, but some part and parcel in our life." Who are the "we" referred to and the "our" whose duty it seems to be to take care of this human wastage, is left to conjecture. It sounds like a piece of impudence, but it is not really so; it is quite unconscious. And this is the utterance of one who is regarded as a "liberal" leader of the Republican party and shows how little we can hope from the accredited spokesmen of the G. O. P. But what do those who comprise this "human wastage" think of it? Mr. White is quite as confused and hopeless as the leaders of the party he is opposing. What becomes of the doctrine of rugged individualism if it is inevitable that any part of the population can be characterized as "human wastage?" Can it be that this includes the workers who produce the wealth of the world?

How Vital is the Singleness of the Single Tax

REPLY TO WALTER FAIRCHILD

By HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM

MUST an advocate of land-value taxation as the major source of local governmental revenues, if endowed with a rational mind, believe literally in the Single Tax as the sole desirable source of all governmental revenues, National, State and local? This question is suggested by Walter Fairchild's courteous and critical discussion, in the March-April issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, of my article, "If Henry George Were Writing Today," which had appeared in the February number of *The Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*.

Mr. Fairchild assumes, apparently, the inerrancy of Henry George; and he argues, in effect, that a more careful reading of "Progress and Poverty" would result in my acceptance of the verbal inspiration of every statement therein and of his deductions therefrom.

From this assumption I must respectfully dissent. In repeated utterances, in print and over the radio, I am on record as recognizing the essential justice and desirability of the collection for public purposes of the community-created economic rent of land. But I do not believe it essential to the purity—or perhaps I should say productivity—of that method of taxation that it renounce all of its former fiscal associates and become a *single* tax. Here was what I said in the concluding paragraph of my radio talk of April 20, 1935, on "The Socialization of Ground Rent:"

"It is not the *single* tax that I am advocating, for my creed is that of a triple-taxer—not a Single-Taxer. I favor properly graded income and inheritance taxes for National