

to dig so much from us in any case. Let us go to sleep again." But Tax Abolition. Here is something to stir the blood. We want to know, and is there not a string to it? No, there is no string to it, and if you can avoid using land, directly or indirectly, which belongs to the public you will be free from paying either taxes or rent. And now that we have your attention we will show you how.

Sixty-five years ago Abolition won a great and notable victory. If we who are proud to be known as Georgeists will only "lay aside every weight which doth so easily beset us" we will make it easy for the next generation to achieve a more notable victory for black and white men alike.

Hamilton, Ontario

E. S. GILBERT.

ALSO VOICES HIS DISSENT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I wish to join those people who propose that the followers of Henry George leave off using the terms *Tax and Taxation* when they are speaking of *Rent* and the *Collection of Rent* (land rent, economic rent). Experience shows that those terms have always caused, and will always cause a great deal of misunderstanding and repulsion.

What Henry George really proposes is *no tax or taxation at all*.

I am perfectly aware that Henry George himself often used the terms "Single Tax" and "Taxation of Land Values," but, nevertheless, these terms are neither scientific nor suitable to the purpose. On the contrary, I am sure, too, that if Henry George had been able to foresee the horrible taxation plundering which has taken place after the great war, and is still growing worse and worse, he would have shunned every hint of that infamous system as having any resemblance whatever to the just system he proposed.

By the bye, it seems strange that Henry George in the first part of "Progress and Poverty," where his elaborate and precise definitions of economic terms are to be found, never uses the words *Tax and Taxation*, but is always speaking of *Rent* ("land rent," "the term rent in its economic sense" "the law of rent")—and then, later on, speaks of *Tax and Taxation* as signifying the same things. Of course, we Georgeists all know what he really means, but the use of these terms is inconsequent and misleading all the same.

Until some fifteen years ago we also here in Denmark used the wrong terms for the right thing; but since then, having been happy enough to find a good and pregnant term, we completely abandoned the words *Tax and Taxation* as having nothing to do with the ideals of Henry George. The term now current in Denmark is *Grundskyld*, which is something like Ground-due, t.e. the land rent or ground rent which is due to the community, or, in other words, the duty which every landholder is liable to pay to the community for holding his piece of land.

In spite of differences of opinion concerning some other more or less peripheric questions here, we are all united in the use of the term *Grundskyld*, and I dare say it is a good step forward as to clearness in our propaganda.

Finally I venture to admonish Georgeists all over the world. Pray, fellows, leave off using the terms *Tax and Taxation* when you are actually speaking of *Rent* and the *Collecting of Rent*, and try to find an appropriate and adequate name for the thing. The sooner this is accomplished, the better for our common cause.

Faxe Ladenplads, Denmark

P. LARSEN.

CONCERNING CONVENTION PROGRAMMES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The November-December issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM* has an editorial squib to the effect as follows:

"The *Square Deal* of Toronto, Canada, complains that the programme of the late Henry George Congress was too full, and that too little time was allowed for discussion. We think our contemporary is right. But we must learn by experience."

The trouble, dear editor, is that we never do learn by experience. The *Square Deal's* complaint would hold good for almost every con-

vention, conference, congress . . . whatever you want to call them, that we have ever arranged. The programme for each session is so overfull, that, even if speakers keep to their schedule, which they seldom do, there is so little time left that any discussion however valuable, started by a speech, must be cut off by the Chairman with a reference to the passage of time . . . "we must get through our programme."

Now, with the exception of the banquet, and the one evening public meeting which are part of each convention, the discussion is the most valuable part of any session where we are among ourselves, or where our visitors are the intelligent public which wants to find out what it is we advocate. Any set talk at these meetings should, and usually does, concern phases of the movements in different parts of the country, or of the world; and questions, or discussion, following that talk will be of more value than some other talk switching off to some other phase, confusing the mind by a scattering of thought-foci. To ourselves, as to any stranger in our midst, searching honestly for the truth we have to offer, such a session with say just one or at most two talks, if possible somehow connected by locality or subject, and followed by an exhaustive discussion of that particular subject, would be of much greater enlightenment and value than the crowded "ragout" programmes.

And far too little time is left for the sessions on Resolutions, on our attitude towards any important political action or movement of the day.

Each time we sin anew. I can remember, in the days when I helped arrange dinners, conventions, meetings of all kinds, that invariably, when I, or some kindred soul, tried to keep the programme shorter, simpler, more coherent, there was the objection. . . . "You haven't enough on your programme to attract the public." I did not believe in this idea, but had to give in frequently. If one may concede—I do not say that I do but others may—that the objection would hold good in case of a public dinner or public mass meeting, I certainly refuse to accept it for a moment, when it is a case of the morning or afternoon intimate sessions of a convention.

If we could just remember these things when making up the programmes, not editorialize about them afterwards, there would not be so much grumbling among those who do much for the Cause, and go hopefully to each convention in search of intelligent discussion that will be of aid in the individual's problems.

For public meetings. . . no. Personally, the usual rambling discussion by the G. P. bores me as greatly as do the overlong programmes. But in our more intimate sessions let us cut out the hash and the entrees and give one, or at most two solid dishes to chew over!

New Canaan, Conn.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

DURING January James R. Brown confined his lecture work to New York and New Jersey. During February about thirty lectures have been arranged for and will include Carnegie Institute of Technology, University of Pittsburgh, and the Pennsylvania College of Women and the Susquehanna University.

THE Indiana University Library, Bloomington, Ind., is in need of No. 6, Vol. 27 of *LAND AND FREEDOM*.

JAMES B. ELLERY, of Erie, Pa., contributes a well written letter on the Briand-Kellogg Treaty to the *Erie Dispatch-Herald*.

WE acknowledge with grateful appreciation receipt of the New York Red Book published by J. B. Lyon of Albany, and edited by our old friend James Malcolm. This very useful book, of which Mr. Malcolm has been the editor for many years, contains the very latest information of how the business of ten million people is carried on, and includes bills signed by the governor, bills favored by the governor and defeated