

quate and comfortable habitations, not to speak of that large class whose lodgings are utterly incompatible with decency and morality?" But as to a dole the speaker simply said, "I have no faith in giving as a remedy for the woes of mankind."

Of that time, as now, Mr. Greeley said: "I have heard complaints that machinery and inventions do not work for the laboring classes, but rather against them." And he then made this additional observation (further using his precise words): "What the world eminently requires is some wise adjustment, some remodeling of the social machinery diminishing its friction, whereby every person willing to work shall assuredly have work to do."

SAM H. SEYMOUR, Chatanooga, Tenn., in *Herald-Tribune*.

#### A SLAP

Mr. Witt and Mr. Doty sincerely believe that they are Single Taxers, and we do not propose to dispute it. But the New Deal economic program leading inevitably to an increasing degree of state socialism, has had few more loyal supporters in Cleveland than Mr. Doty and Mr. Witt.

They and many other local Single Taxers have been doing some of the neatest intellectual somersaulting this town has seen, when they intersperse their Single Tax speeches with periodic huzzas and cheers for the New Deal and the Rooseveltian band wagon march toward state socialism. They would split their sides laughing at anyone who solemnly professed to be loyal at one and the same time to the political philosophies of Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt, but they profess loyalty at one and the same time to the Rooseveltian pattern of state socialism and the Henry George pattern of individualism, shielded against all forms of monopoly. The absurdity of being a New Dealer and a Single Taxer at the same time is apparent to anyone who had made even a casual study of the Georgian economics.

This is the slough of inconsistency and confusion in which most of the Cleveland Single Tax colony finds itself. But a few of them see clearly that the New Deal is not Single Tax, nor the Single Tax the New Deal, but rather that they tend to be the antithesis of each other. Such able Single Tax writers and publicists as Albert J. Nock, Francis Neilson and the Australian, Max Hirsch, have shown beyond question how the Georgian philosophy is poles removed from any trace of state socialism. The official Single Tax magazine, *LAND AND FREEDOM*, has been a most uncompromising critic of the New Deal.—DALE COX, columnist in *Cleveland Plain Dealer*.

#### THE ECONOMICS OF TODAY

The schools of economic thought now dominating the nation and the world are the greatest obstacle to sound economic recovery because they are without any guiding moral principle. Their judgments of measures do not turn upon the question of whether they are right or wrong, just or unjust, but upon the question of their expediency, and their Bible seems to be the Book of the Holy Statistics.

Does this judgment seem harsh? I leave it to you. Last summer a number of eminent reputed economists held a get-together meeting in New York to iron out their differences and present to the world some semblance of a united and coherent front. And the very first article in their new confession of faith was that

"Economics can consider only facts and their relations. It cannot concern itself with political, religious, racial, social or ethical considerations."

Not concern itself with ethical considerations? If a science of human relations is not to concern itself with ethical considerations, what kind of a science is it, and what is it worth to humanity?

It was a greater economist than any who walks the earth today who said:

"Fret not about the morrow, saying what shall we eat, what shall

we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed. Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things will be added unto you."

#### SCIENCE OF ABOMINATIONS

I assert that the so-called science of economics taught in high places today is a science of abominations from which the spirit of truth and righteousness is conspicuously absent. That there are truths in it I will not deny, but they are so detached, disjointed and fragmentary that by themselves they are of little worth. As a whole, the dismal science clearly comes under Isaiah's condemnation:

"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter."

"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."

Whether we regard the Bible as the literally inspired word of God or merely a compilation of the wisdom of the ancients, there can be no doubt that there is in that book wisdom of the highest and deepest significance which the world has discarded as of no value—wisdom which the churches themselves have not even tried to keep alive and vibrant.

From an address by STEPHEN BELL in Paterson, N. J., at the Alexander Hamilton Hotel before 100 bankers of Passaic County.

## Correspondence

#### AS TO INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Let us forget nominal money (circulating medium) for a little while.

Roughly (enough for all practical purposes), interest is the wages of the producers of capital goods.

Interest and wages rise together. That is, the wages of the producers of capital goods rise with the wages of the producers of consumers goods. Otherwise, the production of capital goods would cease. Because competition would pull the producers of capital goods into the field of the producers of consumers goods.

A complete and comprehensive definition of interest is difficult to give. And for all practical purposes it is not necessary.

Back to nominal money:

In a complex society, which is also a free economic state, money-interest is subject to the higgling and jiggling of the market, and will quickly arrive at a point of just equilibrium.

In a free economic state interest can never be exploitation.

This is the crux of the whole matter: Interest can never be exploitation in a free economic state.

Peoria, Ill.

ALBERT HENNIGES.

#### MR. LUXTON ANSWERS HIS CRITICS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am impressed with Hiram Loomis's remarks as to my failure to add anything to the clearing up of the confusion in men's minds as to the meaning of interest and money. That shows very loose thinking on the part of Mr. Loomis. I did not start out to clear up the matter, but nevertheless I did. Except for the slip of calling interest the return for the use of someone else's wealth my definition of interest will stand. It is usually some other person's wealth, but actually it is any wealth used as capital, no matter to whom it belongs. I placed money where it belongs when I said that it is one of the things invented by man to assist him in production.

He does not see the point of my remarks about "biological entity." He does not know that I wished to show that Frank Stevens was worrying needlessly about a perfectly natural state of affairs. But nowhere did I say that truth must cater to the idiosyncracies of the human mind. There can be no compromise with truth. There-



fore why should we argue with Socialists and others who change the meaning of the terms several times in a discussion? It is too bad that Mr. Loomis does not understand that in our evolution most men are still less rational than savages. Those who are slightly more rational than their fellows are those who do the exploiting, cheating, lying, stealing. Those who are more rational, and at the same time just, are still but a small voice crying in the wilderness, but taking a large view of humanity from earliest times I am convinced that we are fulfilling our biologic destiny and are approaching slowly the ideal man.

Mr. Loomis quotes Henry George to show that the selling price will not be destroyed by Single Tax. It is of no concern to me what authorities are quoted. Let us look at the facts. All land held out of use now is so held with the expectation of selling at a price. All land underdeveloped is also so held. The price expected is the highest price possible. Single Tax will certainly destroy such selling prices. Such selling prices presuppose several bidders for the land. The bidders are actuated by what they conceive to be the future demand for the land. In many cases this is pure gambling, but there are many cases in which an astute student of the trend of commerce and industry can foresee future conditions. When the holding of the land has become unprofitable because the economic rent is collected by society for social purposes no selling price will exist, since to fail to pay the economic rent would mean an ouster by the state and no man will want to pay more than the economic rent, which he would be doing if he paid some one for the privilege of taking over the land from him. To hold land then will mean to use it. To hold it idle will mean to pay for it out of wealth accumulated elsewhere. To cease to pay the economic rent will mean that one must give it up.

Now in a circumstance where a person wants a very select spot for a home or a camp and someone else is there already and is satisfied to pay the economic rent, there will arise a situation which might give weight to Mr. Loomis's contention. If the one who wants it badly enough is willing to pay the incumbent a large sum to give it up to him we might think that the sum agreed upon is a selling value of the land. But is it? Is the incumbent holding the land to collect tribute from a future buyer? The fact that he pays his economic rent for a piece of land which is not used in the production of material wealth shows that he is not holding it for that purpose. He is getting a psychic income, rest, recreation, pleasure, satisfaction of his artistic sense, a chance to revel in nature and its joys, and health of body and mind. To ask him to give up these benefits to another who wishes them for the same reasons would be unthinkable without some suitable recompense for their loss. He must forego all these comforts for a while until he can locate a place as near suitable as possible. He must have the annoyance of picking up and vacating, tear himself up by the roots, as it were. Any sum the other is willing to pay must be as equal to the comforts given up and the inconvenience suffered as is possible to compute. If he is willing to pay such a sum, and the incumbent is willing to take it, is this really the selling value of the land? No. And what is more it might be many times the value computed by capitalizing the economic rent at five per cent, depending upon how desirous the purchaser is to get it, and how desirous the incumbent is to stay. It is not the selling value of the land. It is the sum paid by one man to another to give up certain satisfactions. It does not depend upon any supply and demand in cases where others are also bidding. In this case the bidder is limited to one person but there are other parcels of land which he might have.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JOHN LUXTON.

#### A TRIBUTE TO FRANK P. RAND

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Will you spare space for a brief tribute to a veteran Single Taxer, who for nearly fifty years quietly, tirelessly and effectively preached the gospel of equality, of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man as taught by Henry George?

It was at the Anti-Poverty Fair in 1887 that I first met Frank P. Rand, who was born in Maine.

In 1898 I was in Kansas City and met him again.

In 1907 when I went to Seattle, Frank P. Rand was there quiet as ever, effective, and tireless in preaching the gospel.

In 1913 I found him again, in Victoria, British Columbia, still quiet and still busy, in season and out of season.

Always ready to talk Single Tax himself he could not believe anyone else would hesitate anywhere or at any time.

In Victoria he came to me and said "You are to talk Single Tax from the stage at the Princess Theater during the performance next Monday night."

Astonished, I said "What do you mean? An audience pays to see and hear a play, they won't sit quiet to hear some one but in with a Single Tax talk."

He said "You needn't talk very long, but you'll have to talk. I arranged it with the management. They are playing 'Shore Acres' and I told them you were a friend of James A. Herne who wrote it, and whose acting made it famous. The actor who takes Herne's part will call on you in the dinner scene and you'd better sit in the front row, and be ready." So obediently, I climbed over the foot lights, talked Single Tax briefly and escaped alive. Next day Rand called on me and said "You are to talk next Thursday night at the house warming of the new Congregational Church." I went and had a delightful evening with a very fine bunch of people. There was no chance for any Single Taxer to loaf or get rusty with Frank P. Rand. around. He was always willing to sacrifice anyone to advance the Single Tax. Now for him "Out of the darkness has stretched a hand and into the silence has come a voice, 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of the Lord.'" Bolar, Va.

WILL ATKINSON.

#### WE SHOULD BE REPRESENTED AT CONFERENCES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

One thing bothers me tremendously.

Everywhere there are committees and commissions and individuals making investigations and reports on the tax question, and proposals and notions and bills without number are published and introduced, many of them senseless and unjust. But hardly anywhere is the land value tax proposed or considered—the only just and practical of them all.

Why should it not be possible to have an able representative of the Single Tax plan represented at some of these meetings and conferences? Alma, Wis.

THEODORE BUEHLER

#### MR. STEWART RETURNS AGAIN TO THE CHARGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

My letter "As to Interest," in your Jan.-Feb. issue with Mr. Kendal's on "Some Practical Aspects of Interest" and "Note by the Editor," submitted that "The actual identifying of Single Tax with continuance of the present certain interest burden is killing its natural broad appeal;" and that natural law facts call for our standing simply on the law of supply and demand as determining interest.

As we are certainly concerned about the slow progress of Single Tax this is a proper matter to "worry" about. The fact that whatever interest there will be under Single Tax must be natural and just, has no bearing on the present importance of knowing and teaching the truth as to what it will be instead of wrongly antagonizing those whom we must convert to it in order to get it. Teaching that everybody will have capital and get interest—perhaps from the unfortunate and improvident who do not count,—simply cannot help even if it satisfies us to let it go at that.

We all agree that diverted-rent unjustly enters into "the present certain interest burden," giving it such certainty as natural values alone can give; that so far as the vote is determined by relative scarcity of capital (however normally caused) it is just and beneficial