

onstrable that rent will rise as a totality. Taxes on improvements tend to depress land values. With all taxes removed we enter upon a period where all industry is released and the result will surely be reflected in increased land values. Oscar Geiger, in his illuminating lectures, so held and illustrated it with diagrams amounting to a practical demonstration.

Nor do we agree with the author that resort to the immediate collection of the full economic rent would occasion any greater shock to existing institutions than the depression begun in 1929 through which we are now passing. For it must be remembered that with the resumption of man's right to the use of the earth something will have occurred that has marked no other financial shock or depression by immediately abolishing all obstacles that now cause wide-spread unemployment. For with the immediate declaration of a free earth all or nearly all land that has any value would almost at once pass into use. While we need not expect that this great change can be accomplished without certain losses to individuals, such losses would not approximate to the wholesale depression and consequent deprivation to which nearly all classes have been subject in the years 1929-1934.

We do not like the chapters on money, not only because we wholly disagree with them, but additionally because of the abusive terms he uses against the advocates of a metallic basis. His own suggestion for a monetary system, the issuance of certificates based on public improvements, has never had anything but a limited sanction in history and is "void for uncertainty." Knowing the fury of the inflationist when aroused we dread what might happen when a supposed scarcity of money would lead to an expanding programme to provide additional "scrip." We prefer to see the economic fundamentals settled first, leaving the problem of money—if it is a problem—to a generation free to consider it without bias and with a clearer apprehension of natural laws.

This work is written to set Georgists right. But Mr. Green has wholly misrepresented George's position on the question of interest. The work will do no good and may do a deal of harm.—J. D. M.

A FRENCH RENDERING OF CONDITION OF LABOR

Recently, through the enterprise of M. Sam Meyer, leader of the French followers of Henry George, there has been published a fine French translation of Henry George's "Condition of Labor," comprising the famous letter to Pope Leo XIII. The translator was M. Paul Passy who is head of the Christian Socialists of France, but who has taken great interest in urging upon his followers a reading of the books of Henry George. A limited issue of this excellent French translation of a famous book (paper cover—78pp.), is offered for sale in the United States by the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, at the price of 25 cents per copy, postage paid.

Correspondence

IDA TARBELL ON HENRY GEORGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The otherwise excellent article by Ida M. Tarbell in the current *Forum* is marred by coupling the name Henry George, a political economist, with Edward Bellamy, a novelist. The former possessed a scientific, self-trained mind, capable of reasoning from cause to effect. With the precision of an engineer he attacked every economic problem.

The latter lacked these qualities. To associate these two personalities, simply because both dealt with the same subject matter, economic reform, is pointless. There might have been some justification for *contrasting* them.

Likewise, Miss Tarbell is most unfortunate in referring to Father McGlynn as the Father Coughlin of his day. In truth, Father

McGlynn was everything but that. Both, to be sure, were adherents of the Catholic faith and presumed to discuss economic questions. But there the likeness ends.

New York City.

BENJ. W. BURGER.

DR. JORDAN MISSES THE POINT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Dr. Virgil Jordan made an address over WJZ tonight on the topic "National Wealth and Income." It was very cleverly arranged to convey the idea to the listening public that depressions are but natural phenomena in a world in which the distribution of wealth is both just and proper. Such statements by men or women who are entitled to the term Doctor carry so much weight with those mortals of lesser degree of scholastic learning that the need of such institutions of Truth as the Henry George School of Social Science is apparent.

Dr. Jordan began by pointing out that many persons, even government officials, use government statistics to prove the necessity for the New Deal. He was particularly emphatic that the statement that two per cent of the population receive eighty per cent of the income is a fallacy. He then started to define the term National Wealth and included land as wealth. No Single Taxer could find fault with his statement that money, stocks, bonds, checks, etc., are not wealth but mere tickets giving the holders a claim upon the stock of wealth. Not so fortunate was he when he defined wealth as that which enables man to produce an income, showing that he confuses all wealth with a portion of it known as capital.

He blamed government officials and all agitators outside of the government for speaking of the need of a new method of distribution, but the only method he mentioned as possible other than the present one is one of equal sharing by all workers in the products of labor. If he knows that there is such a suggestion as an equitable distribution of income, the full product of his labor to the laborer, the full product of the use of capital to capital, and the economic rent of the land to the whole people, he did not betray himself. In fact rent did not enter into his talk at all and we learned that labor gets so much of the return that capital gets but a trifle. Many businesses have been paying interest and dividends out of their savings of the fat years so that workmen may draw good wages according to the Doctor, all of which may or may not be true, but if true it is because of something that so far as Dr. Jordan's address goes is non-existent.

Dr. Jordan decries the talk about the profit system and seeks to explain that it is a profit and loss system, in bad times the workers taking the profits and the employers the losses. In fact one can hardly be blamed for getting the impression that Dr. Jordan both believes and does not believe in the existence of a depression. He calls the New Deal a New Steal in one breath, and then tells us that we own half the National Wealth and receive more than sixty-six and two-thirds per cent of the income; how else are we to take his statement that of about 27 billions produced in 1933 over 20 billions were paid out as wages, and the rest as salaries, interests, and dividends.

But Dr. Jordan in objecting to the use of statistics to prove what he calls a fallacy is illogical because his own use of statistics is to prove untrue statements since he left rent of land out of the reckoning. Also he states that in a certain year about forty per cent of the population owned their own homes and forty per cent of the farmers owned their farms. This is not true since a large part of these properties were and are mortgaged and are not truly the property of the holders until such mortgages are paid. Furthermore, he speaks of the large amount of insurance on the lives of millions of the population as potential wealth but he does not state that this wealth is partly present existing wealth produced by labor out of land with or without the assistance of capital, and as such it

the same as savings, and partly a wealth yet to be produced by labor in the future. It has no business to be used in any argument to disprove that certain individuals or interests are getting more than their proper share of the wealth produced at any particular time, the national income, in other words.

It might be a good thing for Dr. Jordan if he would acquaint himself with fundamental economics as laid down in "Progress and Poverty" by Henry George before starting out to combat President Roosevelt's policies and the claims of Communists and Socialists in a single speech.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JOHN LUXTON.

AN INJUSTICE TO LINCOLN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

A local daily recently published a communication declaring that a quotation which has for years been attributed to Abraham Lincoln is a discredited myth. In various forms it has been claimed that Mr. Lincoln regarded even interstate trade as leading to social injustice, money being sent out of one locality for goods available at home. Among recent quoters of this apocryphal Lincoln utterance have been Senator Dickinson, of Iowa, Congressman Charles W. Henney, of Wisconsin and the famous Arthur Brisbane.

The matter is said to be dealt with fully in Prof. Taussig's book, "The Tariff, Free Trade and Reciprocity," to be found in libraries, and it appears possible that the quotation has been based, not on any statement of Lincoln, but rather on a fugitive remark of Robert G. Ingersoll in 1890.

Long Branch, N. J., July 6, 1934.

GEORGE WHITE.

THE OLD GUARD IS PASSING ON

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The death of Mrs. Katherine E. Bradley, of Olean, killed in an automobile accident some two months ago, is a very real loss not only to the friends who knew and loved her well, but to our cause. She was an untiring worker, to whom all life was to be understood and explained in terms of the truth as taught by Henry George. Add to this burning conviction the charm of a frail little woman, of disarming gentleness, with a quick motherly sympathy for everyone she met, and you have a combination powerful in its influence for good. Of the many times I was privileged to meet and work with her one memory especially stands out clear in the grief at her passing. We crossed on the same boat to the Copenhagen Conference in '26, Mrs. Bradley, Miss Janet Brownlee and myself. And how often the picture comes back now, of this charming little gray-haired woman sitting, with embroidery or knitting, in a sheltered corner on the deck, an ideal portrait of a gentle grandmother. No one could pass by without stopping for a word with her. And anyone who stopped went away with a Single Tax Tract of some sort in his hand. She always had a pile of them beside her. And most of those tracts were read. For Mrs. Bradley's manner of arousing interest was so ingratiating, so sympathetic of the other's viewpoint, that half the battle was won before the visitor left her. She arranged a meeting in the saloon at which I spoke. Everyone attended and many questions were asked. Several of our shipboard acquaintances did come to some of the Copenhagen meetings.

Many converts Mrs. Bradley made in just that same gentle motherly way. Her sweetness of nature, and back of it the flame of a deep and warm belief, were invincible. Her personal friends will miss her sadly. And our work will miss her as well.

New Canaan, Conn.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

WE TRY TO BE KINDLY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

As a disciple of Henry George, I read with interest our Single Tax publication, LAND AND FREEDOM,

Much of it delights and interests me, but one policy that is pursued by the editor, is decidedly objectionable to me, and I think unworthy of a true follower of Henry George. His was a character which radiated kindness, courtesy, and tolerance. I am convinced that in order to be successful in spreading his gospel, and making converts to the Henry George theory, we must use his methods.

I believe many of the harsh criticism of the Administration and the President are out of place in a publication devoted to the principles of Henry George, which are based upon the Christian Ideal.

In the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, the letter addressed to Sleepy Garment Mills, Centerville, Mich., a copy of which you state was sent to the President, I regard as an insult and therefore, an instance of poor citizenship. If it ever reached the President, his re-action would be anything but friendly to our cause, and after all, are we not striving to make friends?

While you and I feel that the programme of recovery is complicated and economically unsound, that to adopt the Single Tax would simplify and expedite recovery, because it would be working with natural law instead of against it, we should give the Administration credit for right motives, and be patient yet a while with experimentation, for may it not be that Henry George's great philosophy has been reserved for "such a time as this."

I truly hope that if any formal protest against the programme is made at the coming Congress at Chicago, it will be done as Henry George would have done it.

Omaha, Neb.

MRS. H. J. BAILEY.

ON UPTON SINCLAIR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Notwithstanding his endorsement of the Single Tax philosophy as expressed on several occasions in public addresses, Upton Sinclair's advent on the political scene, is, in my judgment, by no means reassuring or helpful to the cause so dear to out-and-out Single Tax followers of Henry George. I have heard Sinclair but once on this theme and once was enough.

Sinclair is an opportunist, a self-seeker and a man with no distinct convictions, save that he is a thoroughgoing Socialist, but so completely befuddled with respect to what is sound economic doctrine as to be discredited by every George man who has heard him, or studied his numerous isms and bewildering theories, some of them contradictory. The occasion on which I formed an adverse judgment of this so-called reformer was the dinner given at Town Hall, New York City, last winter, when the plan was undertaken to bring Socialists and Single Taxers together to determine if there was not some common ground on which they might go forward in efforts to reform the present injustices in our social order.

At that meeting Sinclair demonstrated that he knows but little about the imperishable doctrines of Henry George. While he was saying a good word for the Single Tax in passing, it was plain that his mind was filled with the Socialist's error in declaring that capital is the guilty party and must be punished and rendered helpless by huge taxes on wealth as we Single Taxers define it. If this man shall be able, by his sophistries, to convince a majority of the voters of California that he is the right man for Governor of that Commonwealth, then I venture to predict that the cause of sound social reform will be set back at least a decade, since his attempt to put into effect the various nostrums he is now preaching will very quickly demonstrate their futility, and the electorate of the State will quickly return to a conservative course in politics. In such an eventuality we would suffer since the conservatives would class us as guilty with Sinclair and if we sought to disclaim association with him or sympathize with his ideas, they would simply point to his so-called endorsement of the Single Tax. I repeat that Sinclair is no real Single Taxer and never has been.

Westfield, N. J.

EDWIN J. JONES.