

tructive. I had no advice to give them, but closed with the caution that if they didn't do more than balance the budget with such measures as they proposed they wouldn't be back there two years from now.

I have earned the privilege of talking to Texans pretty straight and they have quit scoffing. The third house that is always present in great numbers fighting any and everything that touches the industry they represent, but studiously avoiding any programme of general relief, welcome me because I can say things that they dare not. I can really enjoy myself even if I do have to beg for a living. WM. A. BLACK.

San Antonio, Texas.

#### FARM SITUATION IN IOWA AND TEXAS CONTRASTED

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I was in Iowa for about two weeks during September. My visit included Des Moines and Cedar Rapids. From my study of conditions, I came to the conclusion that the Iowa farmer is much better off than most of the farmers of the country. Blockading of roads, and dumping of milk and other food products was going on while I was there. From what I could learn, it was being promoted by a man who was being paid \$15,000 a year for managing the insurance of certain farm organizations. His followers were chiefly LAND SPECULATORS, and do not represent more than 25 per cent of the farmers. They bought farm land in Iowa that had been selling for from \$50. to \$75. per acre at the boom-inflated prices of \$300., \$400. per acre. Mind you this is corn-land! I attended a meeting of Norman Thomas in Des Moines. He stated from the platform that 100,000 Iowa farmers had sold out their farms during the boom, and went to California to take it easy. The greedy fools who bought these farms are now trying to pass on to the Government the burden of their mortgages. The farmers of Texas are infinitely worse off, yet you hear nothing from them. I paid five cents a quart for milk in stores in Texas, and ten cents in Des Moines.

San Francisco, Calif.

E. P. E. TROY.

#### CALLS FOR SHORT STORIES THAT ILLUSTRATE OUR TRUTH

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Through the fluent pen of an author of fiction conditions may be made a vehicle for the advancement of the truth.

This thought has come to me as a suggestion, after reading the tale of "Three Men in a Boat" in your last issue, which surely illustrates the idea perfectly.

Of course, the students of economics are men of a serious turn of mind, but surely there must be among them some who are able to mix science with romance and adventure, and thus bring out a blend which has for its purpose an easy access to the minds of the greater number, who ordinarily can not be reached by lectures, or be induced to even approach the subject of political or social economics.

Some years ago, while my daughter attended Dean Academy, I assisted her in her studies in literature, and took advantage of the opportunity to inject in essays the Henry George doctrines, which taught a number of her classmates to think correctly, and caused them to see the errors of the present system. In fact, it so greatly interested one of the professors that it led him to read both "Progress and Poverty," and the "Science of Political Economy."

May not the offering of a prize for good stories advance the cause, and lead to the discovery of those able to write them? I surely enjoy and look forward to receiving LAND AND FREEDOM.

Franklin, Mass.

M. J. VAN LEEUWEN.

#### PROFESSOR FISHER AND THE SINGLE TAX

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I have just read Prof. Irving Fisher's criticism of the Single Tax which was reproduced in your last issue. It is about the weakest I have ever read. Perhaps that is because it is from an eminent professor of economics. These peculiar people seem to live in a world apart. "If

(he says) you happened to live in a country where all pieces of land were equally productive you would have no land rent at all." That country simply does not happen to exist on this planet, so no one, no even the professor, can ever happen to live in such a country. Where we each happen to live is in a country equally productive with every other country of absurd nonsense promulgated by learned professor of economics.

Another gem is: "Clearly taxation should be based primarily on what is needed by the government. Taxes must be made to correspond to needed expenditure, instead of expenditure being made to correspond to accidental land differences." Disregarding the queer statement about accidental land differences, one is forced to ask: Does the professor pay any intelligent attention to the history of the last decade or two, to go no further, as regards the busybodyism of governments generally? At any rate what I have to say applies to our Australian governments, and I do not think they are by any means singular in this respect. Here, governments have been poking their finger deeper and deeper into every pie. With a large spurious revenue derived from customs taxes on heavy overseas borrowings as such loans materialized here in imports, supplemented by a buoyant revenue largely due to the high world prices of our exportable commodities our governments have responded nobly and have done the fairy godmother stunt excellently. An elaborate system of pensions, subsidies, bonuses, grants, etc., was industriously built up which necessitate ever-increasing and ever-expanding governmental departments which flourish as a green bay tree. When the slump came, borrowings were out of the question, and revenue declined greatly. Not so the cost of what are euphemistically called "services." Then adopting Prof. Fisher's dictum the effort was made to balance the budgets by making taxes correspond to expenditure. Heavier and still heavier taxation was clapped on our staggering industries.

Such taxation is one of the greatest handicaps to any chance of recovery. As one industry after another staggered to its knees it was promptly clouted with heavier taxes. Farmers are particularly hard hit by the accumulating effects of vicious taxation based upon false principles. Do our governments attempt to lift the load? Not on your life! They propose farm relief grants and all that kind of stuff—anything in fact which will maintain bureaucratic expenditure which always provides the excuse that taxes must be maintained—of course, to correspond to expenditure. And they are not lacking support even from the so-called experts in economics! Is your experience very different from ours? Is the experience of any other country very different? This way disaster lies, and it is the way in which governments have been steered by professors of economics who seem to be people who have no contact with the every-day, work-a-day, affairs of real life, but who seem to meander about, when they are not writing treatises, in some dream-land far removed from the madding crowd. S. V. LARKIN.

Sydney, N. S. W.

#### NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

*The Press Scimitar*, of Memphis, Tenn., has a column report of an address made recently by Ernest K. Warren. *The Press Scimitar* heads it "Single Taxer Fires Shot at Technocracy." The argument is an admirable one. He analyzed the arguments of the Technocrats and denounced their doctrine as "just another form of Socialism." Mr. Warren is a prominent business man of Memphis.

In the past ten months John C. Rose, of Pittsburgh, has sent over fourteen hundred letters to the press of the United States and foreign countries.

A RECENT issue of the *Boston Globe* contained an interesting story of Louis Prang and his famous chromos familiar to the generation fifty years ago. The story is by Ed. Payne, a feature writer of the *Globe*. No mention is made of Mr. Prang's Single Tax activities, but he was an ardent disciple of Henry George, as was also Mrs. Prang. T.