

hat our "frontiers" seem to have disappeared and labor and capital are becoming beggars in a land of vast opportunity. Fulfilling Lord Macauley's prophesy, our institutions are "brought to the test."

"Doing for men," says Emerson, "what they should do for themselves, is the one ugliness in all the governments of the world."

If that were true when Emerson wrote those words, how much truer it is now. And yet in spite of European examples of what totalitarian programmes really entail and the crushing of freedom that we, on this continent count our birthright—paternalism of one sort or another being urged by some, in both Canada and the United States, who, a generation ago, would have shied at anything remotely resembling it, since it is the antithesis of the American ideal—liberty. And these urgings toward regimentation come chiefly through ignorance of the *science* of political economy. Certainly it is for us, who realize that it is economic maladjustment which is dragging nation after nation into the morass of hatred and force, to work together as we have never worked before. Single Taxers are of necessity individualists, but now is the time for "united we stand," if we hope to point the only way for a lasting peace for a war-crazed world.

There are many different ways of carrying our message and there are Single Taxers to carry it. Obviously, however, if we work together, since that gives us greater power, we must choose the greatest common denominator—and the one programme on which we can all agree, I believe is *education*.

Some of us may contend that political action is the quickest road to education, although it develops bitter resistance and intolerance. Judge Jackson Ralston thinks that putting an Amendment on the ballot for the voters of California to pass on, is the quickest and surest means of educating them. Be that as it may, I wish there had been a hundred extension classes and a few thousand students taking the correspondence course up and down California for two solid years before Judge Ralston had again launched the measure.

If that had happened enough voters in that State would know what the economics of Henry George connoted to make a telling stand against lying opposition and could force proper interpretation where now is powerful misinterpretation. But without such far-reaching preparation by the Henry George School of Social Science the Ralston Amendment is on the ballot, to be voted on in November, and it seems plainly the duty of Single Taxers everywhere, regardless of national or state lines, to help our valiant cohorts in California combat the vicious onslaught made by the privileged powers under the banner of the "Anti-Single Tax League."

Therefore I beg that this Conference make it a major accomplishment to use this great opportunity to spread education in a field where the fear on the part of our

enemies proves our strength; that we do everything possible immediately to make the voters of California understand what the taxation of land values in lieu of all other taxes and the philosophy that goes with it, mean—for ignorance is the only thing we Georgeists dread and we are working together for certain success when we work to spread the Henry George School of Social Science.

For then, with the ever-growing army that understands the natural law "if" as says Henry George, "while there is yet time, we turn to justice and obey her, if we trust liberty and follow her, the dangers that now threaten must disappear, the forces that now menace will turn to agencies of elevation."

From Director Chodorov's Address at Toronto

THE expenses of the Henry George School in 1937 amounted to \$28,150, an average of \$3.47 per student enrolled during that year.

Between January 1 and June 30, 1938, 1,861 men and women took the ten week's course in New York City; during the same time 2,862 attended the extension classes scattered all over the United States. In addition, 2,055 persons took the Correspondence Course.

The new building, 30 East 29th Street, where the School commences its sessions on October 3, contains twenty-one class rooms. At full capacity it will train six thousand students weekly.

Mr. Chodorov's address was indeed most inspiring. On the Foundation which Oscar Geiger gave with so much love and suffering is being reared a lighthouse of economic truth and justice.

Correspondence

HOPEFUL OF REAL PROGRESS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Disappointment was expressed by some speakers at the recent Congress of the Henry George Foundation in Toronto that more progress has not been made in the movement for the taxation of land values. When I first became a convert through reading "Progress and Poverty" I believed such a principle would be adopted very soon because of its justice and far-reaching beneficial results. When that desirable result failed to materialize, even where the curse of landlordism was most acute, it caused discouragement among its ardent advocates, and they became inactive in the cause. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

We have been unable to put a copy of "Progress and Poverty" in the hands of but a few people, hence lack of converts. If we could afford a weekly nation-wide broadcast of the Single Tax doctrine it does not follow that converts could be made in that way. There is no guarantee that people would listen-in, except those who are interested. Religious revival meetings are largely attended by church members because they are interested.

The Henry George School of Social Science is proving its worth as a disseminator of economic knowledge. Its success should give courage to the discouraged to revive their faith and help to the utmost of their ability to bring success in California and after that to unite for the educational campaign in Michigan.

Revere, Mass.

W. L. CROSMAN.

SEEING THINGS IN A DIFFERENT LIGHT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

May I extend my hearty congratulations on the article under

"Comment and Reflection" in the July-August issue of LAND AND FREEDOM?

As you may have surmised, I have been a Democrat ever since the Cleveland campaign and was converted to free trade by General Francis Walker who was my Professor of Political Economy at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and have voted for President Roosevelt on both occasions; yet, as I have written Roger Babson and others, I suppose I am more fundamentally opposed to many of Roosevelt's doings than many Republicans who seem to have no fundamental ideas whatever.

Babson himself agrees that if we elect a Republican in 1940 he will probably have to carry on pretty much the same as Roosevelt, which indicates that the trouble is the unenlightenment of the people as a whole.

As Cleveland said, it is not a theory but a condition that confronts us, and while you would not administer strong medicine to a healthy person as a regular diet it must be given when people are sick. To continue the analogy, even medical treatment ought to be fundamental but unfortunately it is not. This is not always the case, but the use of "dope" by reputable physicians is all too common. So this palliative treatment is not confined to political spheres only but is an unfortunate state of mind of the people of today. Some of this comes, of course, from false leadership and its general acceptance is due to the mass psychology that was engendered during the War and it may take a generation to overcome.

People must learn to think for themselves and it is encouraging to note that some are beginning to do so more and more among the so-called "middle classes" rather than among the "Captains of Industry" and their satellites in small businesses.

I have heard it said that the servants of nobility in England are the most ardent supporters of the system under which they live and it seems that up to now some of those most seriously affected by the unjust system under which this Country is operating are its most ardent supporters.

But even the National Association of Manufacturers is beginning to see things in a different light and possibly we are on the verge of a new era.

Cincinnati, Ohio

CHARLES G. MERRELL

INTEREST RISES WITH PROSPERITY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

My thanks to C. H. Nightingale for his argument that we should not drop this matter of interest till we get to the bottom of it; and my thanks to you for publishing his statement.

But while we are delving into this matter, and while C. H. Nightingale is supposing all these things mentioned (see your page 126, July-August, 1938), suppose some one devote himself to explaining how interest "would go to zero," if the earnings of the people (which would include the earnings of business) "increased to such an extent that every one became a capitalist."

Our earnings in the commercial sense include returns on our capital; this is interest. Suppose borrowing does cease, what of it? Interest is still interest; and it can't "go to zero," when it is soaring in the stratosphere of prosperity.

Stockton, California.

L. D. BECKWITH.

TAXES ON THE IRRIGATION DISTRICTS OF CALIFORNIA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Congratulations on Comment and Reflection upon the psychology of the New Deal voters.

Let me, also, add a word of caution relative to the paragraph on page 126 in which you appear to be quoting J. Rupert Mason on the tax system of the California irrigation districts.

It is true that improvements and personal property are exempt from these irrigation districts taxes. It is even true, as Mason failed

to state, that these taxes are levied on all land in the district, including speculative holdings in the towns and cities of the district and idling land in the rural sections of the district.

But these taxes are flat or acre taxes. A farmer on the last farmland in the far corner of the district on a back country lane pays the same tax per acre that is paid by the owner of a finer farm at the edge of the county seat; so does the owner of a lot in the poorest section of town and on a back street, "down behind the gas works," pay the same tax that is paid by the owner of the best business corner in the county seat, assuming that the lots are of the same area.

There is another thing about these districts that ought to be better understood. Because there is no attempt to recover all the rent and every effort is made, on the contrary, to keep the taxes as low as possible, there is still a speculative value in these lands—that is, the privilege of collecting rent in the districts is still considered valuable.

However, because this value is much less than similar privileges in the cities, these district values have been hard hit by the depression so much so that they got behind on their bond interest.

Then a thing was done that will be remembered with shame when the people get their economies on straight. What happened is that the bondholders were "put through the wringer," and bought out at discounts running sometimes over 30 per cent, and bought out with federal money furnished for the refinancing. Of course it must be remembered in this connection that not a cent of our federal revenue is taxed against land!

It must also be kept in mind that these districts are in the heart of California where the state's fine highways system is at its best, and that not a cent of the expense of these highways is taxed against land!

Then, too, we have a sales tax which has reduced our school taxes to about 80 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation, thus lifting that much more of the tax from land.

All in all, the receivers of rent have been well cared for.
Stockton, Calif.

L. D. BECKWITH.

A FUTILE CONTROVERSY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

There is among Georgists a controversy which has always seemed to me unnecessary, namely, on the question, "Does rent enter into price?" I have never been able to see that there is any real disagreement as to the answer to this question; but whether that answer is "Yes" or "No," all depends on what the question means to the individual answering it. If it means to him that rent, together with wages and interest, is a part of the price which has to be charged for commodities, then the obvious answer is "Yes." On the other hand, if the question means to him that prices of commodities are high because of the fact that rent has to be paid, then the answer is "No."

The latter interpretation of the question was, I think, the interpretation usually in mind until comparatively recently, and, therefore, the older Georgists agreed with Ricardo that rent did not enter into price. It was Mr. Emil Jorgensen, I think, who first prominently insisted that rent did enter into price, and this because his interpretation of the question was as first above given, and not because he had any real difference of opinion about the effect of rent on prices. This is clearly indicated by the following statement from page 31 of his book: "Did Henry George Confuse the Single Tax?": "The illustrious Scotchman (Adam Smith) knew as well as the next man that rent never operated to make the price of goods go up—in other words, that it did not result in making the goods produced on the high-rent lands any higher in price than the goods produced on the low-rent lands."

The moral to be drawn from the controversy is to avoid making a statement that rent does or does not enter into price, unless the statement is modified or enlarged so as to make its meaning clear.