

we should seek to develop genuine excess profits tax in our taxing system."

What are excess profits and who and what should determine them is a problem which we prefer to leave to Prof. Groves.

Through some of these contributions there runs the notion that big business is detrimental. Ray Blougham, Associate Professor of Economics in the University of Cincinnati, says: "Much evidence exists of the danger of the economic power of large corporations."

May we inquire if it is the largeness of these corporations that constitutes their influence for evil, or the possession of monopolistic powers shared by big and little? And just at what point does the small business become possessed of the evils of big business? In other words, how big is big?

That we are involved in strange mathematical contortions that make the less equal to the greater follows from the abandonment of principles.

Ellsworth C. Alvord, lawyer, says: "I also readily admit that given principles agreed upon today might be inapplicable tomorrow." Suppose a chemist or astronomer should reason this way—where would they arrive? Nowhere, the reader will agree. The only science that according to its teachers has no principles is political economy. Yet we pay its professors for expert advice. Is it any wonder we get nowhere. Yet after denying that there is any principle which may not be changed from one year to the next, Mr. Alvord has the temerity to suggest certain principles. But he does show rather successfully the conflicting nature of taxing practices. The article by Mr. Alvord, the longest in the book, is for this reason worth reading.

But why go further? There is little in the book that is contributory to our knowledge. This is because the subject treated is unscientific in itself. You cannot take a subject which has no scientific base and discuss it in terms of science. There is no justification for taxation. It is taking by seizure, and every method of doing this is objectionable. Some methods seem more objectionable than others, some a trifle more brutal, but all are inequitable. For there is a provision in society for all social needs. None of these writers seems to be conscious of the fact. So none of them offers an alternative to taxation. Has any one of them ever read "Progress and Poverty?"

It is, as we have said, an unconscionable mess. Alfred G. Buehler, Professor of Economics in the University of Vermont, has summed it up. He says, "There is no real system of business taxation; there is only a hodge podge of taxes imposed by independent jurisdictions without regard for the practice of other governments." (Divisional jurisdictions.)

A useful bibliography of books on business taxation is an appendix to the work.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

WE have received from Arthur Madsen of *Land and Liberty* of London the Report of the United Committee for 1936. This covers the activities of the Henry George Foundation of Great Britain, the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade and the Henry George School of Great Britain and Ireland. It lists a large number of periodicals in which advertisements of our principles have appeared. These publications comprise a total circulation of over 5,000,000.

ANOTHER welcome booklet published at one shilling is the *Social Science Manual* used by the Henry George School of Great Britain and prepared by F. C. R. Douglass, M.A. It follows the general plan and scope of the *Teachers Manual* of the New York School but contains considerable new matter written with the thoroughness and scholarship that characterize everything that comes from the pen

of Mr. Douglass. A short biography of Henry George with mention of the books he wrote comprises part of the British manual as does also a separate chapter on Interest which indicates the divergent views of the followers of Henry George on the Interest question. In this connection Mr. Douglass says: "Whatever views on these points may be they cannot affect the main argument by which Henry George discovers the causes of poverty and plenty." This British Manual fitly supplements the teachers training course followed in the New York School to which acknowledgment is made, though the British Manual is based, as we have indicated, on a wholly independent elucidation of the text book, which of course is "Progress and Poverty."

Correspondence

THE OPPORTUNE TIME

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The socio-economic outlook of the whole world has radically changed during the last few years. The people are in a more receptive mood than they used to be. They are developing a keener attitude toward the really important things of life.

I believe that the next year, or the next few years, will witness many important changes,—perhaps, for the better. Even now there is marked evidence that the people are beginning to think constructively and independently. The many significant facts, both in our own country and in Europe, indicate that the people the world over are at least striving for something better. But they must be educated in Henry George's philosophy before they can make any real and permanent progress.

Now is the opportune time for Single Taxers, or Georgeists, to get together and launch a real campaign of education.

It would be better, of course, if we could all unite upon some one programme or course of action. But the main thing is action. Whether we teach school, or write letters, or deliver radio addresses, let us do something.

To paraphrase Henry George:

"Let no (Single Taxer) whoever he may be and wherever he may be placed, imagine that he has no influence.

"The (Single Taxer) who thinks (and does something) becomes a light and a power!"

Pittsburgh, Pa.

JOHN C. ROSE.

DIFFERS WITH C. H. KENDAL

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. C. H. Kendal's letter on interest in your May-June issue appears to me to have been the result of some sort of a telepathic divination on his part, for he has presented an excellent example of just the thing I warned against in my article. Mere assertions and appeals to ethics do not prove interest. This fact must first be realized before we can hope to solve such a problem. Mr. Kendal's position on this question is typical of the confusion that invariably attends discussions on interest, for he has offered two entirely different theories to account for the phenomenon of interest—the Productivity theory and the Use theory.

He gives us an illustration in which five men with capital, group A, can produce 40x per man, and five men without capital, group B, can produce only 10x per man. The excess of 30x he declares is interest, but not the slightest proof is offered to support this assertion. In the absence of such proof, it may be stated with equal assurance that the entire 40x is wages. Failing to perceive the relationship between value and interest, he overlooks the fact that in order to prove interest, it must be shown that the 40x less the replacement value of the capital possesses more value than the 10x. We must keep in mind that interest, in the economic sense, is considered to be the increase that accrues, not to any particular capital, but to generic capital. In this matter, we are not concerned with capital