

work as hard and do as much for California, New Jersey or Delaware as for Michigan if we were all agreed, but the idea of filling a gun with bird shot and shooting straight up in the air never did appeal to me. Some day this kind of shooting might get a bird, but?

Detroit, Mich.

A. LAWRENCE SMITH.

### SAVING THE LANDED INTERESTS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It is interesting to note that so many young men who are active in the "New Deal" so-called, are large holders of valuable real estate—Vincent Astor, A. Averill Harriman, William H. Vanderbilt, Henry Morgenthau, Sr. and Jr., Lew Douglas, etc., etc.

Here as in England, the landed interests are willing to try almost any new experiment even though it uses up half of their income so long as it does not in any way endanger the security of large land holders. Perhaps this is not done consciously; but sub-consciously or unconsciously these men are certainly looking for their own interest. Even the men upon whom it would seem we ought to rely are wandering off after strange gods.

The Single Tax is the most radical and at the same time the most conservative of all reforms. It is in line with American thought and traditions; leaves rugged individualism a permanent factor in American civilization as it has been in the past; believes in and advocates individual initiative and the right of the individual to keep his own earnings and to transfer them to his children; and at the same time it will accomplish everything that the New Deal is trying to accomplish without all this complicated mix-up and hubbub which has put the average business man in a position where he does not dare to make a move for fear it may be the wrong one.

I was extremely sorry to hear of the death of Oscar Geiger. Our movement has been fortunate in attracting men who have been willing to sacrifice themselves for the cause.

Fort Atkinson, Wisc.

CHAS. B. ROGERS.

### ALL SINGLE TAXERS WILL NOT AGREE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It was only after I had read Mr. Luxton's comments that I gave serious consideration to the article by Mr. Stephens in the Nov.-Dec. number of LAND AND FREEDOM.

I. Mr. Stephens quotes Socrates, "The beginning of wisdom is the definition of terms," and regrets that no one of five well-known Single Taxers could define Wealth, Money, Interest, Utility, Value in terms that the majority would accept. Mr. Luxton's comment is, "When one considers that man is a biological entity the fact that not one of five prominent Single Taxers could agree upon certain definitions is not to be wondered at. Mr. Stephens expects too much of the human race."

In the same paper, however, Mr. Luxton complains of communists and socialists on the ground that they "change the meanings of terms many times in a single discussion" and asks, "How on earth can one convince such folk?" Moreover in Mr. Luxton's argument on money and interest I find little of anything more than an insistence on the definition of the terms. He concludes with another reference to communists and socialists, "We should not permit them to stray from the field when discussing these topics." How stray from the field? I ask. The answer comes in Mr. Luxton's own words. They "change the meaning of terms many times in a single discussion?"

I find myself in hearty agreement with Mr. Stephens as to the need for accuracy in the definition of such terms as he gave. Personally I shall hold myself more strictly to account than I shall those with whom I disagree. Accuracy of definition is fully as important for thinking as it is for arguing.

II. I find myself also in sympathy with Mr. Stephens in his feeling that if President Roosevelt had Single Taxers in his brain trust

they would find great difficulty in advising him. But immediately I have to part company with him, for if they did not pass out of the picture almost immediately, I believe they would find themselves in the category to which Mr. Stephens assigns Champ Clark, William J. Bryan, Ramsey McDonald, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, and Newton Baker. In passing I must be pardoned for saying that I do not like the tone of voice in which I picture Mr. Stephens assigns these gentlemen to their class.

III. I am greatly surprised, however, at the assumption that land will have no selling value under the pure Single Tax. Mr. Stephens makes the assumption and Mr. Luxton says that all Single Taxers are agreed as to that. I am not in agreement, and I claim to be a Single Taxer.

In support of my position I quote from "Progress and Poverty," Book VIII, Chapter II, about a page from the end.

"When the common right to land is so far appreciated that all taxes are abolished save those which fall upon rent, there is no danger of much more than is necessary to induce them to collect the public revenues being left to individual landholders."

In this Henry George at least recognized the possibility of something being left to the landholder in the nature of selling value. I am of those who believe that he thought this to be desirable as well as possible. I believe he meant exactly what he said when he said, "Let them buy and sell, bequeath and devise." Land should be worth at least enough to bring in a year's taxes in case of refusal to pay.

I am not so rash as to predict the conditions that will obtain under the full Single Tax. At the same time I do indulge in speculation and imagination as to what will come to pass. I believe that most, perhaps all, Single Taxers hold that the private and individual possession of land is a necessary condition for the highest civilization. I want to suggest the possibility at least that the retention of a selling value to land may be a necessary cog in the social machinery to render to the individual the things that are the individual's and to Caesar the things that are Caesar's.

Chicago, Ill.

HIRAM B. LOOMIS.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

E. H. BOECK of St. Louis writes: "Your comment in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM points out how impractical it is to have these annual gatherings of Single Taxers when the money they cost could be spent in more practical ways." James B. Ellery of Gloucester, Mass., comments as follows: "I agree with you fully in what you say regarding the Henry George Congresses. Does the money they cost advance the cause as a whole?" E. W. Doty of Cleveland also endorses our opinion, and says: "Some of the papers belonged to a chamber of commerce or rotary meeting. Some of our Single Taxers need to be taught what the Single Tax is and what it is not, especially what it is not."

M. V. WATROS, a new subscriber from Fairhope, Ala., writes: "I knew Henry George well. My most treasured possession is a copy of 'Protection or Free Trade' which was presented to me by Henry George himself."

CHARLES G. MERRELL of Cincinnati, O., has an interesting letter in the *Cincinnati Post* and draws the editor's fire who says partly in reply: "Now that all land has been taken up, there are some who contend dolorously that the passing of the frontier has taken with it the opportunity of individual advancement; that American progress must necessarily slow up." And hasn't it.

THE Henry George League of New Jersey held a largely attended dinner on the evening of December 6, in the Down Town Club of Newark. About 150 were present. Dr. John Dewey, while chiding