

and the inspiring leadership of Norman Thomas, and what it forecasts. In the pages of this issue will be found a number of communications from friends of the movement who have hastened to contribute their voices to the discussion.

LET us insist to those who take issue with us that we are not defending the claims of extreme Socialism. We are only in favor of such Socialism the tendency of which is to conserve individual rights. Where there is no other way of protecting the individual against the extortions of monopoly, then let the government, either by ownership or regulation, exercise those powers for which government is ordained. Under the Single Tax there will be few such emergencies for action by city, state or nation. Nor would we quarrel with temporary expedients while we wait—and work for—the coming of that era of freedom in which natural opportunities are free to industry. Labor laws, factory laws, old age pensions, even if provided for out of current taxes, are legislative expedients with which it is fruitless to quarrel.

THE extreme doctrinaire position has, we are convinced, done us no good. The Single Tax will settle most if not all of these questions, but at a time when certain evils can be ameliorated, we make unnecessary enmity by a narrow antagonism. And after all adjustments must precede settlement. It is well enough to say that nothing is settled until it is settled right—and that is true. But few questions are settled at once. Experiment must precede demonstration. If old age pensions, for example, were the general practice of the states the revenue for their payment would soon cease to be derived from current taxes. Logic would point to the true source of such payment. The same impulse of humanitarianism that had helped to build up such a universal pension system would naturally, we think, turn to those values that are created by the community and attach to land. And our business—and indeed our opportunity—would be to indicate this true source.

OUR brilliant correspondent who appears also as our critic—Mr. Edward White, of Kansas City, Mo., rather misses the point. The argument is largely irrelevant, for we are not arguing for Socialism—certainly not for Marxism. We are as much of an individualist as our clever Kansas City friend. But it is a condition not a theory that confronts us. Here is a great party coming in our direction. The possibility—not at all remote—is that it may, under the new leadership, espouse our cause. What then should be our attitude? Such an advocacy would undoubtedly be to minimize much of what the Socialist party has hitherto stood for. Our question is so transcendently important that it naturally dwarfs every other proposal, mainly because it resolves the difficulties

which these proposals are intended to cure. It will undoubtedly arouse such an army of antagonism that every Socialist speaker and advocate will have all he can do to combat the new opposition. Every other question will take a subordinate position. The party will lose some of its *soi disant* followers but it will gain a host of new adherents, and lose none of those who know their Socialism.

## To the Man in the Street\*

NO doubt you have wondered why wages are low, rents high and men and women unemployed, why people are forced to live in slums and millions are slaughtered in war. Well there's a reason for such evils; they don't just happen, and a man named Henry George who wrote a book entitled "Progress and Poverty," tells us why they happen and the remedy for low wages, high rent, unemployment, slums, war, etc., and it does not require a college education to understand the remedy. Henry George says that it is labor applied to land that produces all wealth including the necessities of life (such as wheat, corn, potatoes, etc.) The following question now arises, Why is it that labor, the producer of all wealth, suffers from poverty and its many attendant evils? Why is it that labor produces all wealth but does not possess it, while many possess wealth that they do not produce?

Henry George in "Progress and Poverty" answers as follows. It is due to the fact that the land (the gift of God from which labor produces the necessities of life) is rented by landlords to the workers for billions of dollars and the landlords exchange the ill-gotten billions of land rent for the labor products of the workers, thereby producing a world of masters and slaves. As the rent of land is due to the presence and productive and inventive powers of man, it therefore follows that the entire rent of land belongs equally to all the people. In fact it is the duty of government to collect all of our land rent for public needs and then abolish all taxation. If the entire rent of land were collected for all of our public needs landlords could not exchange the billions of ill-gotten land rent for the labor products of the workers as they do at present.

Today we hear a great deal of earned and unearned incomes. What is an unearned income? It is an income that some one earned but does not receive, while some one receives an income that they do not earn. Under the present system of "Each one for himself and the devil take the hindmost," a few win and the great majority

\*At the suggestion of our good friend, Erwin Kauffman, St. Louis, Mo., we shall print in each number of LAND AND FREEDOM a simple elementary exposition of our principles. This first article is from the pen of George Lloyd who has had many years experience in explaining the Single Tax to the average man in halls, on street corners, and over the table. His knowledge of how the mind of the average man works fits him for the task assigned him in the present instance.

—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

lose, while under the system advocated by Henry George, namely equal rights for all and special privilege to none, everybody would profit and none would lose. Not one person in a hundred thousand realizes that the commandment, Thou Shalt Not Steal, means the land rent of the people as well as the pocketbook of an individual. Many people wonder why panics occur and why the workers cannot buy back the things they produce, thereby causing under-consumption (not over-production). Why factories clog up with goods and business men fail and workers are discharged and forced to compete with other men for jobs. The answer is, the workers cannot buy back the things they produce and pay landlords billions of dollars in the form of land rent for nothing. (Landlords do not provide land). By so doing workers are billions of dollars short of their purchasing power.

Another very important phase of the present evil system is as follows. The City of New York is to spend one thousand million dollars during the next four years (1930-34) for public improvements. (Schools, subways, bridges, tunnels, etc.) The improvements will increase the rent of land hundreds of millions of dollars of which the city will collect 25% to pay for the public improvement, leaving 75% of our land rent with landlords for nothing. In other words, every public improvement is a liability to the city and an asset for landlords, as 25% is to 75%. Plainly the germ of destruction is in the present system. It is estimated that some \$600,000,000 or 75% of our annual land rent in New York City is not collected for our public needs. That means \$600,000,000 of our wages and salaries must be taxed out of our pockets for public expenses to make good the loss of \$600,000,000 of our land rent, leaving us \$600,000,000 less of our purchasing power. Very few people realize that we could ride in the subways, elevated trains, busses and trolley cars without paying fares if all of our land rent were utilized to run the city. Does The Man In The Street know that no wheel in a factory turns productively until land is put to use? And yet when a building is erected, thereby giving work directly and indirectly to practically every worker in the United States, and at the same time making business hum, the owner of the building is heavily penalized by an unjust and unnecessary tax while those who withhold 50% of the land in Greater New York from use are encouraged to do so with the hope of profit when they sell. Thus withholding land from use means unemployment, high rents, slums, etc.

We should change the present evil system of taxation so that those who put land to use shall suffer no added tax and so that those who keep land out of use could not profit by so doing. Then jobs would be seeking workers instead of workers seeking a job. The slogan of The Man In The Street should be "Collect all land rent for public needs and abolish taxation," (which is the doctrine of Henry George). That would bring economic freedom to all and make the United States a tax free nation.—GEORGE LLOYD.

## Economic Principles as Expounded by Henry George in "Progress and Poverty"

PRIZE WINNING ESSAY (DR. MARY D. HUSSEY  
FUND) BY HELMUT SCHULZ, BROOKLYN  
TECH. HIGH SCHOOL

HENRY GEORGE'S masterful politico-economic treatise, "Progress and Poverty," was motivated by a noble ideal, the betterment of humanity in a very definite and practical way. His method would give hope of realization to the fundamental sentiments expressed in the Declaration of Independence; it would be the materialization of the dreams of philosophers and social thinkers without recourse to destructive revolution; it would bring the results that were expected from the "Philosopher's Stone," the increase of wealth for the benefit of all mankind; it would be the coming of the "Kingdom of the Prince of Peace."

Henry George was perplexed to find that amid the phenomenal progress of material civilization, there should be a proportionate increase in poverty and all its concomitant evils. What could be the answer to this problem? He looked at the heavens and saw only such symmetry and order as bespeak the planning of divine intelligence; he looked at nature and saw nothing but beauty and a system that seemed to benefit all of its component parts; he looked at "the crown of all creation" and he saw misery, vice, and starvation amid the splendor of palaces, magnificent machinery, and other evidences of vast prosperity. He could not believe that this was the work of Him who guides the stars in their orbits, or makes huge trees grow from tiny seedlings, but rather that it was due to the maladjustments of men in their relations to one another. His problem then resolved itself into determining the cause of the evil, formulating a remedy and giving it to the world, so that *all* the people might truly enjoy "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Henry George succeeded; he solved the problem, saw the remedy, and in lucid terms, showed its justice, application, and effects. If the people would only grasp this "Magna Charta of economic liberty," they would be freed from the bondage of poverty; industry would be stimulated to the production of unprecedented wealth; and government would be simplified to that level where ethics in politics would again be possible and Plato's "Republic" become a reality. In the following lines I shall endeavor to present the fundamental economic principles of Henry George, so that the reader may see the logic of his philosophy and become, as I have, a disciple of this great thinker and a fighter for the social reform that he advocated.

Since insufficient wages must be the fundamental cause of poverty, an inquiry as to the reason for the tendency of wages to a minimum, despite constant improvement