

To the Editor:

I am in receipt of a notice that my subscription to The News has expired. This, to me, is highly satisfactory, as I find its articles such an emasculated concept of the *basic* principles underlying Henry George's reasons for putting forth his tax reform ideas, that I can find no pleasure in reading them.

As you may know, there are two phases of Henry George's work; the Cause and The Remedy. His remedy has always been open to argument, and always will, I guess. But it is with his remedy that I find much misunderstanding, and especially so among the clique who seem to dominate the policy of your paper. In my book, there is no difference between the guy who robs me of five dollars, and the guy who robs me of a thousand dollars; they are both thieves: and their work is thievery. Just because your small businessman *tries* to be honest; he imagines he is honest, all the while he is practicing a system which is dishonest.

The whole tendency of the articles in your paper is to further confuse people with honest desires to know and understand. The article by Pinkney C. Walker in the August issue shows how even an educator is confused. Under a proper system *capital* would *not* come from individual savings, but from the general wealth created by *labor* as a whole. Therefore; it could have no returns only to the fund of *wealth* as general fund, which would apply to *all* the people. There would be no need of saving with individuals, merely a sufficient surplus stock to tide over emergencies in the economy at large.

Your little business man, is only a big business man in embryo. All he lacks is the opportunity and the means. The end he seeks is the same. And, while some of you honest souls may not know it, the little business man has subsidised your movement; he controls its policy and orders its management. And, he has emasculated its real worth to the people.

—JOHN R. RICHARDSON  
San Diego, California