We have all heard those foolish performances called a "Single Tax Debate." The debaters on either side may make all kinds of unwarranted assertions, and ninety-five per cent of the audience will not know fact from fiction. The debater with the best voice and manner, and most pleasing street argument about preserving the great American Home, always wins in the opinion of the average audience. It requires some elementary knowledge of fundamental economics to judge the merits of a Single Tax argument. And that is something not possessed by the average voter any more than by the average editor. A street argument on the Single Tax is mere confusion. It is much the same with most Single Tax lectures to the average audience.

But write on your banner "Abolition of Landlordism," and run your banner to the top of the highest flagstaff, and I think you can stir up the enemy. It is such stirring up of the enemy that will stir up the friends of justice. "Abolish Landlordism" will have a real and definite meaning to the man in the street. It may not be the true meaning, but he will be put on active inquiry. The best means of abolishing landlordism will follow in proper order.

Oshkosh, Wis.

JOHN HARRINGTON.

FROM THE EDITOR OF LAND AND LIBERTY EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I noticed today your quip at "Townsend" and you will be interested in the February Land and Liberty article on him. He may be daft but his daftness is no madder than the schemes that the politicians are putting over everywhere in the name of national policy. If a Townsend did not exist, decent nature would have to produce him in order that all those policies should be ridiculed out of court.

As I write, here comes a letter from Mr. Crowell of Sandwich, Mass., who is interested in one of the extension classes under the auspices of the Henry George School of Social Science in New York. He asks if "Progress and Poverty" has been translated into Finnish. The answer is YES and I am sending Mr. Crowell the brochure of the translations we got out in 1910, to which however sundry additions have since been made-such as the Dutch translation of "Protection or Free Trade" and new Spanish translations of everything. From Australia I had inquiry for the French translation; from another country for a Japanese translation (not existing) and the other day came an air-mail letter from Burma all in a hurry from two able scholars there who are translating the book into Burmese. Still another correspondent, this time from Bagdad, writes he is busy translating one or more of the addresses (and I think "Progress and Poverty") into Arabic.

Are these "straws in the wind?" I think there is more than that in it. Judging by our own experience and the immense amount of correspondence that reaches us from all parts-the kind of correspondence that calls for information, for answers to questions, for explanatory literature, with reports of local activities-the movement is marching along in very good health and confidence. And here we have to deal also with letters, journals and reports in many languages -German, Danish, French, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese and sometimes Norwegian. When it comes to Russian and Magyar and Bulgarian, we are stumped. As to such matters, it has been a great compliment to know that that Russian article of mine has been translated and published in Danish, Spanish and Bulgarian. London, England. A. W. MADSEN.

FROM ONE OF THE AUTHORS OF "UTOPIA DAWNS" EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your review (Jan.-Feb. issue) of John Pratt Whitman's "Utopia Dawns," have you not missed the important point that this author has sketched in his own Utopia, in chapter twelve, a society in which the Henry George principles are put into practice? Here every citizen obtains his land from the Central Council, and builds his house on his life-time lease, paying no taxes. Out of this basis the good things of Utopia grow. You say you do not like Utopias but they stir the imagination of the people who want Progress without Poverty. Why not use every possible chance of stirring people to action? Neither the Single Tax principle nor Utopia can be said to be yet realized on the earth but the ideas have to come first, do they not? ELEANOR WOOD WHITM/ N. Boston, Mass.

REFUSES TO TREMBLE BEFORE THIS FRANKENSTEIN EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Perhaps I am just a trifle dull; not apt enough to recognize a "problem" when I meet it; for to my mind all this tempest in a teapot (I say this with diffidence) concerning this problem, interest, is conjured out of such stuff "as dreams are made of." A very proper subject, to be sure, to engage the valor of Socialists and NRA champions and their ilk ad nauseum, but scarcely a matter for debate between men who have knowledge of the science of economics.

Is it, or is it not, true that there are three factors concerned in the production of wealth, or are there but two? If the former, is one of these factors, one of the partners in the enterprise, if you will, to secure a lesser and lesser proportion of the product while each of the others receives more and more until his share reaches the point of extinction? If so, I cannot comprehend why he shall consent to stay in the firm; I should think the poor fellow would withdraw and set up for himself. If the latter, why keep up the fiction longer? If Friday, fashioning nets, spades, slings, while Crusoe fishes, digs and hunts is to get no part of the increased fruits of Crusoe's labor I cannot exactly understand how he is going to keep on making them, nor why he should consent to do so if he could accept that he acquiesce in his status of slave and be content to take what will keep him alive so he may serve his master.

Surely Mr. Stewart's Frankenstein monster which makes \$20,000 "the equivalent of a never-dying live worker is of the nature of those horrid monsters, half serpent and half man with which our childhood Bibles were embellished to frighten the unrepentant sinner unto righteousness, meningeal vapors from a poorly digested dinner, mayhap. Is capital indestructible that its growth is never arrested until, on this hypothesis, it must finally swallow the earth? 'Then let us join the Socialists in their ceaseless attack upon so portentious an enemy. Have we, indeed, at last discovered immortality and find it attached to the products of our own hands?

I have to have cars (Fords, to be sure), in which to get about to do my work; and would you believe it, they just keep wearing out. I want to be put wise as to where I can get hold of this self-perpetuating capital. I shall be glad to contract, tomorrow, with some capitalist at eight per cent on the price of a car, I to take care of all upkeep and he merely to furnish me a new car when this is worn out and upon the same terms. And I shall save many good dollars over my present necessity of buying new cars with my own money.

I suspect that this terrible Frankenstein is born of the illusion that money is capital (It is pretty difficult to get rid of this child of our early "education"), when in fact it isn't capital at all, and no one would pay interest to get it except that it is a recognized draft upon the wealth he proposes to secure with it and for which wealth he is glad to pay interest because in using this wealth, which becomes his capital, he will have more wealth of his own after paying this interest than he could produce without it. I have heard of no Georgist who proposes, when this reform has been accomplished, to compel men to borrow whether they think they shall profit by it or not. Men refrain from borrowing if they find they do not need to do so. And if one employ one's own capital instead of borrowing, is there any crucial issue at stake whether he decompose his earnings into wages and interest or lumps them together as total income? The assessor will not then be prying into the matter.

Your columns of Comment and Reflection are the choicest draught I get from the feast of good things found in every issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. I can put away the other articles to a more convenient season, but I have to read these first choice pages as soon as 1 get