

large properties. The result is that the big land owners are disappearing, but opportunity has come to small farmers who are called "chacareros."

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN, Secretary.

The Executive Committee of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation has engaged in a job that ought to interest the followers of Henry George in every part of the United States. Briefly, the Foundation has undertaken a nationwide search for a scientific proof from public records or otherwise, that the phenomena arising from the extension of lack of purchasing power on the part of would-be consumers, which is called business depression, is directly related to the artificial scarcity of land arising out of monopoly and speculation that prevail in times of so-called prosperity. Henry George has pointed out that what from the side of the businessman is called "business depression" is from the side of the workingman, "scarcity of employment," and that the one always comes with the other and passes away with the other.

It is the idea of President Hennessy of the Foundation, with which his associates are in full agreement, that Georgists should translate their theory into a demonstration by marshalling evidence of unquestionable character, to show that business depressions, their cause and cure, are most intimately related to the land question in all sections of the country. An interesting letter is going out to leading followers of Henry George throughout the country, asking for cooperation in getting together the material evidence that is required on this big subject. The letter follows:

We are engaged in attempting a job that I am sure will interest you, and in which I would like to have your help.

Followers of Henry George for years have been contending that the main causes of business depressions and unemployment are land monopoly and land speculation. The argument to sustain this contention is to be found in Book V, Chapter I of "Progress and Poverty," and in other writings of Henry George. To most of us, I believe, the conviction that George was right has been founded not upon academic theory, but upon our own practical experience and observation.

But the *facts* upon which George and so many of his followers have based their beliefs in this regard have been disputed even by economists who pay tribute to George's high intellect and integrity. A well known and friendly professor recently wrote a letter which is, in substance, as follows:

He declares he has yet to see a convincing demonstration that the effects of land speculation have been such as to make business conditions fluctuating instead of relatively constant. Conceding that land speculation might be a very great evil, he contends that there is no *definite evidence* that its effects account for the undulations of business. Conceding that it *may* account for them, he asserts that *there is nothing by way of evidence* except a bare assertion, that rent increases until somehow and somewhere it checks production, which in turn checks demand. The professor says that George's argument *requires evidence* that the speculative rise in rent really causes people to stop producing goods.

Now we would like to give this eminent professor, who is our friend, the "convincing evidence" which he has never seen. Can you help us to do it out of your observation and experience in your part of the country?

What we want is not any mere repetition of assertion, but concrete

*evidence*, such as the professor as a scientific man might rely upon. The operation of the factors of land monopoly and speculation in the rural regions, as well as in urban territory, should be taken into view wherever the observer or commentator may support his conclusion by references to established facts that may be verified in common knowledge, public records or otherwise.

Among other aspects of the inquiry might be the allegation, where supported by evidence, as to the extent to which the failure of bank mortgage companies, real estate companies, insurance companies, and the ramifications of such failures may be traced to land monopoly and land speculation. The influences of these factors upon the public credit of municipalities in many parts of the country should not be excluded from any competent fact-finding survey in your territory.

The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation in its endeavor to get the material together for subsequent examination, analysis and possible publication in adequate form, earnestly invites you to help us to locate the evidence that will sustain our theory.

Most of us, I believe, have no doubt that George was right. Will you help us to prove it? If you will, please write, giving us the verifiable evidence so far as it applies to conditions in your state.

CHARLES O'CONNOR HENNESSY, President

## But We Must First Clear the Way

SINGLE TAXERS are distinctly divided into two schools. The All-at-Oncers represented by the *Commonweal* and its editor W. Graham Peace of London, and the other group represented by the *Land and Liberty* of London, formerly edited by John Paul, and since his recent death by A. W. Madsen.

Of this school we have in this country, LAND AND FREEDOM edited by Joseph Dana Miller, and several active organizations, among the number the Henry George Foundation of Pittsburgh, George E. Evans, President, and the Manhattan Single Tax Club with Charles H. Ingalls, President.

I have been writing thus far only as to the technique of reform, but as to FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES there are now among the social reformers two distinctly different philosophies. Nearly all the Single Taxers and many Municipal Ownership reformers adhere to most of the principles of what has been called the Manchester School of Economics, as taught by Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill. On many respects Henry George belongs to this school of economics. One of their most significant doctrines is the LAISSEZ-FAIRE or Individualist Alone doctrine. Henry George believed in it and contended that the harmony of interest, and general public welfare would accompany free competition. Alexander Pope caught the idea when he said "The state of nature was the reign of God."

CHESTER C. PLATT in Batavia, (N.Y.) *Times*

AT present, in this vicinity the best part of the landscape is not private property; the landscape is not owned. But possibly the day will come when . . . fences shall be multiplied and man-traps and other engines invented to confine men to the public road, and walking over the surface of God's earth shall be construed to mean trespassing on some gentleman's grounds.—THOREAU.

WHAT has God given to one that He has not given to another? Has the common Father of all created out some of His children? You who claim the exclusive enjoyment of His gifts, show the testament which disinherits your brother.—ABBE LAMENNAIS.