

*When, and only when, we have satisfactorily established each and every one of these five points, have we proved our case.*

\* \* \*

Long before Henry George, thousands of years ago, in fact, wise philosophers, great religious teachers, and deep thinkers in the realm of political economy had perceived that our earth, because of its unique nature, could not be private property, like buildings, suits of clothes, or food, which labor produces.

Henry George's contribution to the solution of the age-old problem of want in the midst of plenty, consisted of this:

He showed how, by applying land rent for our common needs, and abolishing taxation, we, in effect, established the inherent right of every human being to live equally with every other human being. Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, among others, had missed this vital point.

I have already indicated the importance of a sound understanding of fundamental politico-economic principles. It requires a thorough comprehension of wealth, how it is produced, and how it is distributed, to grasp the philosophy of Henry George. Especially, it requires a clear conception of the definitions of the terms of political economy; land, labor, capital, interest, wages, rent. Henry George devoted one chapter of twenty-six pages in "Progress and Poverty" to defining the terms he was about to use, before setting out to solve the problem of the unjust distribution of wealth. Geometry, which like political economy, is an exact science, first defines the terms to be employed and sets forth its axioms and postulates before offering its problems for solution.

How can we explain our philosophy to the Socialists, for example, who include land monopoly in the term, "capital;" or to the man in the street, to whom, "landlord" signifies only the individual who owns the building in which he lives, who in many cases, has leased the ground, and is not a *land* owner; or the term rent, which to the man in the street, connotes the payment he will be called upon to make on the first of next month, solely, he believes, for the three-room apartment he occupies? He has never paused to think that land has a value separate, and distinct, and apart from the improvements in, on, or above it.

Or the terms, wealth and property, in which most persons include also land; or the term real estate, which includes two such diverse elements as land, placed here by the Creator, and improvements on land, produced by the labor of human beings? Or the term profits, which as commonly used, may signify wages, interest, rent, any two, or all three? Ask the next person who talks about, "production without profit," which of these he has in mind.

It is of vital importance then, if we would be under-

stood, that the terms of political economy mean exactly the same to our listeners as they mean to us. How far would I get, in solving a problem in geometry for you, if you understood a triangle to be a four-sided figure? Or, suppose I, speaking only English, tried to convey a thought to you, speaking only Spanish, how far would I get? The story of an American in Spain, in this situation, is pertinent. Being very thirsty, after a hot summer's day's journey on foot, the American sought a glass of milk; unable to make known his wants in the vernacular, he drew on the bill of fare the picture of a cow. Within two minutes, the Spanish waiter returned with tickets for a bull fight. (Incidentally, this bears out what I have previously said, about seeing things, not as they are, but as *we are*.)

\* \* \*

Believing that Henry George correctly formulated the laws governing the production and distribution of wealth, the HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE has been chartered, under the Laws of the State of New York, to teach the science of political economy. We confidently believe that the student who familiarizes himself with the simple laws of that science, cannot help become an advocate of the Georgeian philosophy.

"Correct thought," wrote Henry George, "must precede right action. Where there is correct thought, right action will follow."

## Address of Charles O'Connor Hennesy

PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION  
FOR FREE TRADE AND LAND VALUE  
TAXATION

HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, SEPTEMBER 27

**I**T seems to me very fitting that a gathering of the professed followers of Henry George, wherever held should devote some part of its proceedings to the international aspect of Henry George's philosophy.

This is particularly true at this time, when, because of recent events in Europe and in Africa, the civilized world is confronted with the actual prospect of a new World War, more terrible in its implications than that which only a few years ago brought death to millions of human beings, and grief and misery unparalleled to countless other millions throughout the world.

Henry George considered himself a citizen of the world. The concept of freedom which is at the base of his teachings, meant to him freedom for men everywhere under the sun. We know that he did not esteem mere political freedom for which men in all lands have striven mightily as essentially important unless the proceeds of government served to arrive at economic freedom. Without the establishment of economic freedom in producing wealth, and justice in its distribution, he predicted that

increasing wealth in any land must benefit the few rather than the many. Free governments, even when democratically controlled, would, without economic freedom, have no tendency to extirpate poverty and the social evils which poverty engenders and no influence in elevating society as a whole, or in lightening the burdens of those compelled to toil for a living.

It seems to us as students of Henry George, that there is an inevitable relationship and interdependence between the causes of war and those causes that produce periodical industrial depressions and widespread poverty in all lands. George realized this nearly sixty years ago, and recently, as some of you may know, his daughter, Anna George de Mille, resurrected a remarkable but forgotten passage in an address which her father made in which he forecast the idea of a league of nations that forty years later was called into being by the vision of a President of the United States. Here in his own words is the vision of Henry George in 1877:

"It is too soon to hope that it may be the mission of this Republic to unite all nations of English speech whether they grow beneath the Northern star or Southern cross, in a League, which, by insuring justice, promoting peace, and liberating commerce, will be the forerunner of a world wide federation that will make war the possibility of a past age and turn to works of usefulness the enormous forces now dedicated to destruction."

Let me repeat for emphasis, Henry George's vision of an International League:

"which, by insuring justice, promoting peace, and liberating commerce, will be the forerunner of a world wide federation that will make war the possibility of a last age, and turn to works of usefulness the enormous forces now dedicated to destruction."

This may recall to some of you the language of Locksley Hall, that noble poem of Tennyson with his notable prophecy of the ultimate coming into being of a "Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World." Only today I was told at the New York Public Library that Tennyson's famous poem was not published until 1886, or eight years after the utterance of the noble vision of Henry George.

Our present League of Nations seems to have been the concept of Woodrow Wilson, whose primary idea of putting an end to war through an approach to economic freedom was lost in the shuffle of the treaty makers at Versailles. You will recall that in his Fourteen Points upon which the war Armistice was granted, Wilson contended for

"the removal so far as possible of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all nations consenting to the Peace, and associate themselves for its maintenance."

And now may I recite a little history which particularly relates to the guests from over-seas who are with me on this platform this evening.

Nine years ago, a splendid international gathering of followers of Henry George assembled in the beautiful city of Copenhagen in Denmark, over which I had the great honor to preside. Through the influence of Mr. Folke, one of our guests tonight, who is the splendid leader of the Henry George movement in the Danish kingdom, his government extended extraordinary courtesies and honors to the International Congress of Georgeists there assembled. The Parliament houses were turned over to us, and the government radio station and noted cabinet ministers addressed our meeting.

Subsequently in London, there came into existence the formal organization of the International Union for Free Trade and Land Value Taxation which, in 1929, held another notable conference in Edinburgh. Its formal object may be compressed into this sentence, taken from its Constitution:

"To stimulate in all countries a public opinion favorable to permanent peace and prosperity to all people, through the progressive removal of the basic economic causes of war as these causes are demonstrated in the writings of Henry George."

Now, a year after the great Copenhagen meeting of Georgeists attended by the representatives of twenty-six countries, the Council of the League of Nations at Geneva, issued a call for an economic conference designed to find a way to end the new World War, that is, the economic war that was then and is still going on between the countries which participated in the making of the Treaty of Versailles, which had been ostensibly designed to put an end to the wars of the future. The multiplication of trade barriers, of tariffs and quotas, of import and export restrictions, and other interferences with the basic right of friendly peoples to do business with one another, was not only destroying the possibility of economic recovery but it was generating hates and fears and jealousies and bitterness. These conditions were leading many of the nations to a vast increase of destructive armament, on the sea, on the land, and in the air. "Something must be done about it!" was the idea behind the calling of that first Economic Conference of the League of Nations,—a recognition of the Georgeist contention that the fundamental causes of war are economic in their character.

Well, this young International organization of ours with its headquarters in London, decided not to wait for the unlikely event of an invitation to attend this League of Nations Conference. It prepared an address to Geneva, an address printed in a number of European languages, in which the official delegates of the League of Nations were told what was the matter with the world

and how it might be cured. I have a copy of that historic document here tonight in the English language, and it seems to me it is as true tonight and as prophetic as it was seven years ago when our committee, consisting of Arthur Madsen, our International linguist, accompanied by F. C. R. Douglas, great economist of our movement on the other side of the sea, presented their argument informally and unofficially to the statesmen of fifty nations who had been called to find a way to end the economic war that was then and is still going on.

The statesmen were reminded that the world of today constitutes a single economic organization, for there is no longer any nation which can call itself self-sufficient. Division of labor has long ago transcended national boundaries, and the argument for the necessity of free intercourse and trade between nations, has now acquired an overwhelming significance because the interdependence of peoples is greater now than ever before.

We told the statesmen at Geneva that the international division of labor is the economic basis of civilized life, and that the duty of Governments now is to reconcile the legitimate claims of nationalism with that economic internationalism which has grown up in spite of statesmen, everywhere.

We pointed out that the impoverishment of people in Europe and elsewhere, the growth of unemployment, reduction of wages, and the gross inequalities in distribution of wealth due to land monopoly and oppressive taxation were giving rise to problems of more than national importance. These things were creating a state of mind among the masses of every country which, on the one hand threatened stability of governments, and on the other hand encouraged the idea of economic improvement by means of territorial expansion at the expense of backward and distant people.

We pointed to the antagonism and friction caused by interference through tariffs and through other means, with the normal exchange of the products of labor between friendly peoples. We pointed to the fact that the struggle for new markets and the sources of raw materials stimulated the demand for colonial expansion, for trade concessions and for protectorates.

When one reads this document of the Georgeists International union today, one sees how prophetic it was when it pointed out that it was a truism of historical study that the struggle for raw materials and new markets expressing itself in colonial expansion and the forcible annexation of territories, the establishment of treaty ports, and resorts to war for extension of colonial possessions, has been one of the chief causes of international jealousies and discord.

We have only to point across the sea to Geneva tonight where the dire issue of war or peace hangs as if by a slender thread, to realize how clear was the vision of the followers of Henry George whose plea to that Economic Conference was ignored when we asked for the breaking down of

tariff barriers, the existence of which were plainly inconsistent with a League pledged to the maintenance of world peace so long as public policies should continue to be based on the theory that the producers in one nation should aim to bring advantage to themselves at the expense of the producers of another nation.

We pointed out that there could be no permanent political peace in the world in the face of a continuance of economic war.

Well, it is now history that the first great Economic Conference of the League of Nations adjourned without action or agreement upon action. In a scornful editorial at that time, the *Manchester Guardian* declared that the Conference was but a waste of time and that it ended simply in oratory and futility.

I have never been convinced, however, that our arguments were without influence at that Conference, because I know first that our indefatigable linguist, Mr. Madsen, was so tireless in the distribution and accentuation of our argument that he seemed to have impressed the splendid President of the Conference, Mons. Theunis of Belgium, who, in a final review at the close of the Conference, used this language:

"The main trouble of the world today is neither any material shortage in the resources of nature, nor any inadequacies in man's power to exploit them. It is all, in one form or another, a maladjustment—not an insufficient productive capacity, but a series of impediments to the full utilization of that capacity. The main obstacles to economic revival have been the hindrances opposed to the free flow of labor, of capital, and of goods."

A better argument for what was then and what is now the matter with the world, or a better argument for Henry George's philosophy of freedom, as a cure for it all, could hardly be made by Mr. Madsen himself.

Well, there have been other Economic Conferences held since then, and many Conferences looking to the disarmament of nations, all of which have led to the same end,—speeches and futility.

But the Henry George International Union with its friends, and followers of Henry George in many lands, will still carry on, realizing that the great truth which our inspired leader, Henry George, sought to make plain, for the benefit of mankind everywhere, must, in the Providence of God, ultimately triumph if there is to come an era of enduring Peace and Prosperity for the peoples of the world.

**N**OW, is it not as much an impairment of the right of property to take a lamb as to take a sheep? To take five per cent or twenty per cent as to take a hundred per cent? We would leave the whole of the value produced by individual exertion to the individual. We would respect the rights of property not to any limited extent, but fully.—Henry George, San Francisco, Feb., 1890.