

pro quo to those from whom, in the last analysis, the incomes in question are drawn. * * * Thus a business concern may, as the National Cash Register Company was proved in court to have done, misrepresent a competitor's goods."

In this and in some of what follows Prof. Brown is confusing *earnings* with fraud and misrepresentation. It is clear that the earnings of labor are *wages*. That those who practise fraudulent tactics derive an *income* therefrom is granted, but it is not *wages* and therefore not *earnings*. Labor in political economy earns *wages* and the *income* from fraud is something else again. Something of the same criticism applies to what is said of interest—the *earnings* of capital—on page 37.

After all what is indicated are small defects. We are glad to have Prof. Brown saying:

"And those enthusiasts for government ownership of all natural resources, who would have the public buy up these resources from the present owners at current values are, in this view, simply proposing that the tribute now collected as rent or royalties or dividends shall be given an added sanction and shall be collected in the future as interest on government bonds, to the payment of which government will be pledged. These natural resources *had no cost of construction*. Their salable value seems to be but the capitalization of tribute. To issue government bonds for them, is, therefore, it may be said, only to make this tribute-rendering more irrevocable than before." Page 53.

In Chapter III, "The Rent of Land and its Taxation," Prof. Brown gets fairly into his stride. Single Taxers will regard this as the most important part of the work. On the whole it is admirably done. But there are several parts where we would again disagree, and it is perhaps well to indicate these differences that the position of Single Taxers may be made clear to all our readers. On page 156 our author says;

"A number of enthusiastic—perhaps some would call them fanatical—Single Taxers contend that any other tax than a tax on the rental value of land is necessarily morally objectionable, that the State has no right, under any circumstances, to levy on the earnings of capital and labor, that the rent of land should suffice for all governmental expenditures.

"I do not hold to any view so extreme. The services of government are important to all of us, except, possibly, criminals. All of us benefit, though perhaps in varying degrees which cannot be precisely measured, from the existence of government."

This looks like a *non sequitur* and is no real justification for any other tax where land rent is sufficient to meet all public expense. Single Taxers believe that the thought is better expressed in the statement that if the rent of land meets all expenses it is the only value that ought to be taken, that because it is a public value and labor products an individual value, it is both immoral and inexpedient to tax the latter.

Great public exigencies and the need of revenue not immediately to be met by sufficient land rent, may justify the taxation of labor products—but surely not otherwise. Therefore in all ordinary circumstances the taxation of labor products may properly be characterized as immoral without incurring the charge of fanaticism.

We are sorry that Prof. Brown has given us a hiatus in his reasoning that needs to be bridged. He has shown us how the various taxes, taxes on mortgages, on gasoline, amusements, etc., etc., are devised for the special purpose of securing immunity for publicly-created land rent.

If he had not characterized this process as immoral we want to do so on Prof. Brown's own showing, for he has intimated that a number of those in high places are not without a guilty knowledge of what is being done. But when our author tells us that "if popular ignorance prevents the taxation of publicly-created land rent it would be better for capital and labor to supply government wholly from their earnings"—if anybody else but Prof. Brown has said it we should be compelled to smile at its naivete.

We would not convey for a single minute the impression that these slight flaws militate against this most admirable work. After all they are merely thoughts in passing and do not affect the conclusions. They arise from Prof. Brown's desire to examine every angle, and may be said to be a tribute to his thoroughness even where we have been compelled to question them.

There is no better treatment of our economists anywhere than is

contained in Chapter IV, "A Taxation Complex of Some Political Economists." It is subtle and unusually keen in its analysis. We wish we had room to quote, but the work should be read by every student of political economy. It is really a great contribution to our literature.

J. D. M.

A VERY READABLE BOOK*

This work by W. H. Donaldson, of Joliet, Ill., "The Plutocratic Pauper," is a paper bound book of 204 pages. It is our doctrine told in dialogue in which about thirty persons engage.

It is very readable and appears to us economically sound. Besides it is fundamental. Perhaps too great an emphasis is laid upon speculation in commodities, and minor deficiencies in our economic system, but these are recognized as dependent upon the ownership of natural resources. We have no disposition to point out the claims with which we might disagree; this the general excellence of the work forbids. On the whole it is well worth while.—J. D. M.

*The Plutocratic Pauper. Paper, Price \$1.

FAREWELL TO REFORM*

A young man of 28, after wading through a few hundred books, most of which have been published since 1900, reaches the conclusion that our twentieth century reforms made little or no impression on civilization. Although our author has been most diligent in setting forth the activities of the past thirty years, his book is as noticeable for what it omits, as for what it contains.

If Robert Ingersoll was referred to, why was Dr. Felix Adler, the vastly more important head of the Ethical Movement, omitted? Certainly the latter's constructive work in the same field will live long after the former's destructive work is forgotten. Likewise, why was there no mention of the Christian Science Movement which, no matter how one may feel about it, has had a profound influence on large numbers of our fellow citizens.

The active Progressive Education Movement which, under the notable leadership of Dr. John Dewey, Dr. William H. Kilpatrick and numerous others, will slowly but surely revolutionize our educational system, is mentioned only "en passant."

The great improvement in modern journalism typified by such newspapers as *The New York Times*, *Boston Transcript* and *Christian Science Monitor*, is ignored.

But most glaring of all omissions is the failure to refer to the great Health Movement which, during the present generation, has spread like wild fire through the United States.

Our author, it is true, refers to Upton Sinclair's "Jungle" which hastened the Pure Food and Drug Act of June 30, 1906. But, nowhere is there any reference to Dr. John H. Tilden of Denver, Col., who is recognized by the cognoscenti as in the very front rank of Health Reform. The amazing extent of this reform would strike our author if he would compare an 1883 Bill of Fare with one of 1933, or contrast the universal use of medicine in the former age with the natural methods of cure in use today.

Throughout the book, the author betrays his ignorance of fundamental economics. On the very first page, for example, in discussing the farmer he repeats the Socialist jargon of producing "for use, not for profit." Evidently our author feels that Capital is not entitled to wages for its hire.

Jumping now to Chapter X, this reviewer offers a prize of a wooden nickel to anyone who will explain the meaning of sentences such as these picked at random on pages 318, 319 and 320 respectively.

"The Chase-Soule group gets around the immediate necessity of considering politics by positing the 'organizing man.' This man, they say, following the lead thrown out by Veblen, may save society because the industrial set-up demands that he be given a free rein lest we all perish. But what is the 'organizing man' but our old friend, man, the 'political animal'?"

*Farewell to Reform, by John Chamberlain. Price \$3.00. Liveright, Inc., New York City.

"Prosperity, it must not be forgotten, is a function of a rising market."

"A Board with the power to control investment could, by easy alliance through politics with the top economic planning board, also control obsolescence."

The references to the Single Tax will prove of interest to readers of LAND AND FREEDOM.

On Page 48 our author writes:

"However intelligent and desirable it may be, the Single Tax offers little for marching men in the modern world to take hold of."

"Henry George appealed to these men because the State, in 'Progress and Poverty,' was reduced to a gang of tax collectors who were, periodically, to raid the landlords." (Page 57).

"The Single Tax is deceptively simple, deceptively perfect. On paper it hasn't a flaw; all its implications flow directly from George's own splendid definitions. But its definitions are—just definitions; one is not compelled to use George's geometry, for there are other axioms in an Einsteinian world. George, for example, failed to explore the whole question of the ownership of surplus value and whether or not creative brains are as much a 'natural' resource as a gold mine or a prairie." (Page 66).—B. W. B.

A GREAT WORK*

In this volume of a little less than 600 pages Henry George receives his first definite assignment to the realm of philosophy. His sphere of thought is seen to be not the merely restricted economic field but the whole region of activities which constitute man's thought and being. Henry George is now found in a higher altitude than any previous commentator has been able to track him. The Henry George of Dr. George Raymond Geiger is a more impressive figure than is possible to any mere biography. We begin to appreciate the towering genius whose thought is destined to shake a world.

The work is not in the nature of an eulogy, and the impression of greatness is not gathered from what the writer says directly. Rather it is subtly conveyed. Dr. Geiger has done his work in no spirit of laudation. A calm, quite austere aloofness is the characteristic of what the author has written, yet we are conscious that we are asked to look on one of the most significant figures that has ever trod the earth. Yet the scales are never absent; our author weighs this philosopher and his conclusions with scrupulous exactness.

It is not a work to be skimmed through. It is high thinking and is not easy reading because high thinking is not easy. It was Goethe who said that "The Highest cannot be spoken in words." It is at least true that in an excursion into the higher realms of human reasoning and into the domain of rapt philosophy where the atmosphere is rarified to a degree that makes difficult its translation into the vernacular, we must proceed with caution and slow steps.

But after all philosophy is only a process of weighing, pondering and considering. Henry George proposed a tremendous change in the social order. He buttressed his defences with a system of philosophy that is all-embracing.

No embodiment of that philosophy since "Progress and Poverty" appeared has been so significantly achieved.

It is hard to speak of this work in words that will not sound superlative. The word "scholarly" only half defines it. For that definition would not tell how the thought of Henry George is wrested from the content of his great works, the economic philosophy linked with the ethical, and the nice distinctions of George's reasoning facilitated for our more complete understanding. And to this task Dr. Geiger has brought a more general knowledge of the literature of the movement in all languages than is possessed by any man living. No summary of our philosophy will in future be complete without reference to this most important contribution to its literature.—J. D. M.

*The Philosophy of Henry George. By George Raymond Geiger, Ph. D. Cloth. 596 pp. Price \$2.50. See advertisement on back page of cover.

Correspondence

THE SCAPE-GOAT DOLLAR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The "best minds" of the country have been making every attempt to solve the present depression, and instead of trying to find out the cause of it are looking for an excuse. Conservatives, as well as radicals have come to the conclusion that the fault lies in the fact that the dollar is becoming more expensive, therefore goods are cheap. They continue by saying that if they could raise prices, conditions would improve, labor would be employed, goods would be sold and prosperity would again return.

To bring this about, it is proposed (a) to cut down the gold content of the dollar, (b) to remonetize silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, (c) to start the printing presses turning out dollar bills.

From 1918 to 1929 these same philosophers held that the rising price of goods was due to the falling dollar, a 50 cent dollar as they call it. Today there are just as many dollars in the country as there were during the period of so-called "prosperity." The only difference is that those people who need the goods have not the dollar with which to purchase.

There are several ways in which to increase prices, if this is what the best minds propose to do: (a) curtail the production of goods to a minimum, (b) forbid the importation of all goods, (c) place a set price by law on every article either grown or produced in the country. This, of course, will raise prices, but the goods can only be purchased by those who have the dollar. Those who have not the money and cannot purchase at the low prices today, surely will not be able to buy the goods when prices have gone up.

Reducing the gold content of the dollar, or printing more dollar bills will not place the new dollars into the pockets of those who need money with which to purchase the necessities of life.

The high prices of goods, up to 1929, were not caused by a falling dollar, but since everybody was working there was a demand for goods and merchants were making large profits. In other words, purchases were competing with each other for commodities and prices went up. Today, 12 million men are out of a job and the merchants are competing with each other for business and are offering their goods at a low price, taking less profit.

During the hectic days of prosperity, workingmen were condemned for buying silk shirts at \$12.00 a piece. That, of course, was good for the manufacturer as well as the retailer. Wages were high, piece goods were expensive, and the retailers not only took a profit on what they sold but also made a profit on the material from which their products were manufactured and also a profit on the wages of labor. These great minds point out, and the advertisements in the newspapers tell us, that a suit of clothes which now sells for \$18.00 formerly sold for \$40.00. We know, however, that in the good old days of prosperity a suit of clothes that retailed for \$40.00 cost no more than \$15.00 to manufacture. The manufacturer sold it for \$20.00 and the retailer sold it for \$40.00. So then we had a situation in which something that cost \$20.00 to produce, labor had to pay \$40.00 to buy it back again.

Now one can get a good suit of clothes for \$18.00. The retailer certainly does not lose any money on it. He pays less to the manufacturer, the manufacturer pays less for his goods and wages have been reduced for the reason that workingmen are competing with each other for a job. In spite of the elaborate advertising, in a suit of clothes today while the style is as good as ever, the lining is poorer, and less attention has been paid in putting the suit together; consequently it is worth much less than the higher priced garment.

This holds good for every other commodity manufactured. Competition is now setting the price and not the manufacturer and retailer. Should labor again be steadily employed there would be an increased demand for goods and competition for goods always raises the price.

CAPITALISM is the name given a system under which owners of true capital are exploited and robbed.