

This is in reply to the Guest Editorial by Bruno Eichert in the Autumn GJ. First, he asked about my success. My arguments are not based on my success but rather on George's and the Communists' success. Think about what George did. He started with nothing and within a short span of years built a movement he did not think could be stopped. Look at his speeches, books and articles; see if you can find any that do not say the land belongs to all the people. Listen to him: "The sentiment of justice is yet fundamental to the human mind, and whatever dispute arouses the passions of men, the conflict is sure to rage, not so much as to the question 'Is it wise?' as to the question 'Is it right?'" The causes of the Civil War were many, the least of which was slavery. But when it came to a battle cry, it was "die to make men free."

Look at the success of the Communists. Country after country, with as many different leaders, but one argument - give the land to the people. Why couldn't it have been us? Well, we are selling "tax reform", which doesn't inspire.

Second, Mr. Eichert asked about converts. I once had a rather good history professor who spent half an hour on George as the man who opposed unearned increment. He went on to explain how good art rising in value was unearned increment. Converts? Converts are a product of getting the issues discussed. I was set to discuss the issues in that course, but I never found out what the issues were. George never asked for converts, he asked for free and open discussion of the issues. It is still all we can ask today - get that and converts will come.

Third, I agree that most of my friends believe land should be private property. But I would go a step further and say that even if they could be convinced otherwise, most couldn't care less. Yet I do believe that there are people who are unhappy, who feel things are wrong, and who would work like the devil if we could only point the way.